A HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL STUDY OF THE NĀṬYAŚĀSTRA OF BHARATA

Anupa Pande

KUSUMANJALI PRAKASHAN
JODHPUR

A HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL STUDY OF THE NĀṬYAŚĀSTRA OF BHARATA

Anupa Pande

KUSUMANJALI PRAKASHAN
JODHPUR

A HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL STUDY OF
THE NĀṬYAŚĀSTRA OF BHARATA

A Historical and Cultural Study of the Natyasastra of Bharata

ANUPA PANDE

Published by
KUSUMANJALI BOOK WORLD, JODHPUR

Price : **Rs. 450.00**

Edition : **1996**

Published by :
Kusumanjali Book World
41-A Sardar Club Scheme
Jodhpur-342 011

Published by Kusumanjali Book World, 41-A, Sardar Club Scheme, Jodhpur-342 011 (India) and printed at Printing House, Jodhpur-342 001.

कां सोस्मितां हिरण्यप्राकारामार्द्रां ज्वलन्तीं तृप्तां तर्पयन्तीम् ।
पद्मे स्थितां पद्मवर्णां तामिहोपह्वये श्रियम् ।।

अतुलित-बल-धामं हेम-शैलाभ-देहं
दनुज-वन-कृशानुं ज्ञानिनामग्रगण्यम् ।
सकल-गुण-निधानं वानराणामधीशं
रघुपति-प्रिय-भक्तं वातजातं नमामि ।।

Preface

Although the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata is known to be an encyclopaedic source for the reconstruction of ancient Indian social and cultural history, it cannot be said to have been adequately utilized so far. Much of the work which has been done so far relates to the dramaturgy of Bharata. Thus Sylvain Levi and Sten Konow, A.B. Keith, S.K. De and P.V. Kane have attempted to trace the history of Sanskrit drama and dramaturgy and V. Raghavan, R. Gnoli, Masson and Patwardhan have sought to elucidate the aesthetic concepts involved in this literary tradition. Mankad, tarlekar, G.K. Bhat and Manmohan Ghosh have written on Bharatan theatre compendiously. On dance Dr. Kapila Vatsyayana's work is well-known. Acharya Brihaspati, Dr. Premlata Sharma, Dr. Mukund Lath, Svami Prajnanand have commented on several aspects of the development of ancient Indian music. Despite such scholarly attention, it remains a fact that there has been no adequate treatment of Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* as a whole. Nor has there been any attempt to analyse it from a historical point of view or to bring out its social background.

Much of the work done so far discusses the theatre from a technical point of view as defined in the tradition of literary criticism. It does not sufficiently attend to the fact that drama involving social representation may serve to throw light on social history. Formal categories of dramaturgy may in effect be congealed facts and values deriving from social life. The present work, thus, explores the technical world of theatrical conventions, practices and ideas from the standpoint of social history.

At the same time, unlike the usual practice, the focus in the present work is on the musicology of Bharata, not on his dramaturgy. In interpreting the text of Bharata in this area recourse has been taken to other ancient texts in music but especially to the admittedly difficult but illuminating commentary of Abhinava Gupta. Explanations of ancient terms by modern interpreters like Fox-Strangways, Clements, Alain Danielou, Mark Levi, Acharya Brihaspati etc., have been critically considered and special attention given to theatrical music.

Bharata treats the performing arts as parts of *Nāṭya* and *Nāṭya* as social representation. Expression, communication and representation are essential processes through which the arts operate. Their formal and technical categories cannot be divorced from social facts, attitudes and values. From this point of view the *Nāṭyaśāstra* acquires the aspect of a highly significant social and cultural document from which

one may glean not only the outward appearance, manners and gestures of the people in its age but also their inner psyche and social relations. It is from this point of view that the present work seeks to put together the social and cultural data of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* and placer them in the context of their historical development.

In the scheme of Bharata the various arts meet in the theatre and find their inner unity in the concept of *rasa* in which aesthetic and social values coincide. The present work seeks to bring out *inter alia* these unifying strands of the arts.

The distinctive approach in the present work may, thus, be defined by its socio-historical orientation, focus on musicology, and the analysis of aesthetic and social values.

The present work is based on a dissertation with the same title accepted by the University of Allahabad for its degree of D. Phil. in 1987. The original work has been revised and updated into its present form in the light of further study and reflection made possible by the Research Associateship granted by the University Grants Commission in January 1989, and forms the first part of a series of monographs planned on the *Nāṭyaśāstra* tradition.

My deepest debt is to Professor B.N.S. Yadav, former Head of the Department of Ancient History, Culture and Archaeology, University of Allahabad for his never-failing guidance in my research work. I am also beholden to my other teachers in the Department especially to the late Professor G.R. Sharma, Professor U.N. Roy, Professor S.N. Roy and Professor S. Bhattacharya. Professor K.D. Bajppai, Dr. S.P. Gupta, Professor V.S. Pathak, Dr. Mukund Lath, and above all, the late Dr. Jai Dev Singh, the celebrated musicologist, have helped me through their reprints, books and suggestions from time to time, and I am grateful to them. I must also record my gratitude to Shri M.C. Tiwari and Shri Raghuvansh Tiwari for their assistance and courtesy. Finally, but for the kind interest of Professor S.R. Goyal the present work would have remained on the dusty shelf and without seeing the light of the day so soon. I can never express my gratitude to him sufficiently.

It would hardly be appropriate to speak of gratitude towards my parents, Professor G.C. Pande and Shrimati Sudha Pande. or towards my mother-in-law, Shrimati Brajangana Pande or my husband, Shri D.P. Pande, whose affectionate interest in my work has afforded me constant emotional support. Even my little son Anshuman has been considerate by not being over-demanding !

Allahabad, 12.06.1990 **Anupa Pande**

Contents

Abbreviations

AB	:	*Abhinava Bhāratī*
ASI	:	Archaeological Survey of India
ASS	:	Anandasrama Sanskrit Series
AV	:	*Atharvaveda*
BB	:	*Bharatabhāṣya* of Nānyadeva
BG	:	*Bhagavadgītā*
Bṛ	:	*Bṛhaddeśī*
Ch. Upa	:	*Chāndogya Upaniṣad*
DN	:	*Dīgha Nikāya*
GOS	:	Gaekwad Oriental Series
IA	:	*Indian Antiquary*
IHQ	:	*Indian Historical Quarterly*
JASB	:	*Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*
JAHRS	:	*Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society*
JBRS	:	*Journal of the Bihar Research Society*
JDL	:	*Journal of the Department of Letters*
JRAS	:	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
Kalā.	:	*Kalānidhi* of Kallinātha
Mbh.	:	*Mahābhārata*
NŚ	:	*Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata
PHAI	:	*Political History of Ancient India*, by H.C. Raychaudhuri
PTS	:	Pali Text Society
RV	:	*Ṛgveda*
SBE	:	Sacred Books of the East
SBAW	:	Sitzungsberichte der kōniglische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin
SN	:	*Saṁyutta Nikāya*
SR	:	*Saṅgīta Ratnākara* of Śārṅgadeva
S. Rāj.	:	*Saṅgīta Rāja* of Kumbhā
Tai. Brā	:	*Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*
Tai. Saṁ	:	*Taittirīya Saṁhitā*
Tai. Upa.	:	*Taittirīya Upaniṣad*

Chapter 1

The Nāṭyaśāstra and its Date

The Nature and Date of the NŚ

The *Nāṭyaśāstra* deals with theatre in the most comprehensive manner. It is not simply an elaborate treatise on dramaturgy, but the most ancient and authoritative surviving treatise on histrionics, dance and music. "The term '*theatrics*' is perhaps the most appropriate word to represent its Sanskrit denotation."[1] The author is designated Bharata or simply *Muni*. The work has also been designated by Abhinavagupta "*Ṣaṭtriṁśakam Bharatasūtramidam*."[2] It was also known as '*Śatasāhasrī*.'[3] Bahurūpa Miśra, in his commentary on the *Daśarūpaka*, refers to an earlier and larger work consisting of twelve thousand *ślokas*.[4] In the *Bhāvaprakāśana*[5] it is stated that from the *Nāṭyaveda* of twelve thousand verses, the Bharatas produced a summary of six thousand verses. This earlier and larger work has been lost, only some quotations from it survive. There is also a tradition that originally the *gāndharva-veda* composed by Brahmā consisted of 36,000 *ślokas*.[6]

It seems that tradition recognised three stages in the development of the *NŚ*—an original work attributed to Brahmā; a later work of 12,000 verses, apparently in the form of dialogue between Śiva and Pārvatī; and the present treatise by Bharata. Abhinavagupta refers to three different schools of earlier opinion, namely of Sadāśiva, Brahmā and Bharata.[7] He combats the view of some 'disbelieving critics' (*nāstikas*) that the *NŚ* was not the work of Bharata but a work intended to prove the superiority of the *Brāhmamata* over the other two.[8]

It has to be remembered that the word 'Bharata' was not simply the name of a particular sage, but also a word signifying an actor or *naṭa*.[9] It is, thus, possible that the present *NŚ* was not the work of a single sage, but rather a comprehensive handbook of actors, traditionally handed down and enlarged. This would explain its encyclopaedic scope, highly technical exposition and a severely practical style which generally eschews theoretical discussions. On the other hand, the work as it exists is highly systematic and by and large consistent and unified. The hypothesis about a composite authorship is already mentioned and criticised by Abhinavagupta "*ekasya granthasya*

anekavaktṛvacanasaṁdarbhamayatve pramāṇābhāvāt".[10] It certainly shows the unifying activity of some great mind or minds responsible for its original conception and final redaction. Since Bharatamuni is described as a master of drama and stage-craft (*NŚ*,ch. 1) and the head of a long line of theatrical experts, there is no real contradiction between the two views. A theatrical tradition existed among the actors nnd producers and Bharata himself, conversant with their practice, systematically epitomised the tradition.[11] A similar situation is found in the case of the *śilpaśāstras*, where also one can see the combination of the practical tradition of craftsmen with the intellectual activity of sages or seers. The fact that the actors and craftsmen worked in guilds, made the growth of tradition in a more or less codified form easy. Without postulating a close association between the practical experience af artists and the theoretical activity of intellectuals or seers, the growth of the *NŚ* or of the *Śilpaśāstra* or of other similar *Śāstras* would hardly be intelligible.

It is for this reason that the dating of the *NŚ* presents serious difficulties. Diverse dates have been proposed by different scholars[12] from c. 500 B.C. to c. 300 A.D. It has been reasonably argued that the *Mālavikāgnimitram*, *Kumārasambhavam*, *Raghuvaṁśam* and *Vikramorvaśīyam*[13] of Kālidāsa and the *Amarakośa* presuppose the *NŚ* which would, thus, be pre-Gupta. The fact that Mātṛgupta, whom tradition connects with Kālidāsa and Harṣa-Vikrama are said to have expounded the *NŚ*,[14a] would strengthen this supposition. From the 8th century onwards, there was a long line of commentators on the *NŚ*, such as Lollaṭa, Udbhaṭa, Śaṅkuka, Bhaṭṭanāyaka and Abhinavagupta.[14b] Apart from commentators, literary critics like Bhāmaha and Vāmana appear to have been versed in the *NŚ*. Although the dating of Bhāmaha has attracted much controversy, his treatment of the Buddhist principle of *apoha* and his closeness to Daṇḍin suggests a date between the 6th and 8th centuries for him.[15] The anteriority of *NŚ* to Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Bhaṭṭi is also clear from its rudimentary treatment of *Alaṅkāras*. Thus a pre-Gupta date for the *NŚ* cannot be seriously contested.

On the other hand, Keith argued that the Prākṛtas of Bharata are later than those of Aśvaghoṣa,[16] though he does not substantiate or elaborate it. If we examine the contents of the *NŚ*, we find it referring to Khasa, Vāhlīka and the Mlecchas.[17] Again, the mention of Śakāra, if it implies a reference to the Śaka *janapada*, as was the opinion of some ancient commentators, and also the plain reference to Śaka, Yavana, Pahlava and Bāhlika would suggest ą date not earlier than the end of the second or the first century B.C.[18] The refere-

nce to the Pāśupatas[19] would harmonise with this. The reference to Bhārata as *karmabhūmi*[20] is redolent of the early Paurāṇic atmosphere as is its picture of the gods and myths. At one place, the kings are described as celebrated in the Vedic tradition and as born of the gods.[21] This cannot but remind one of Manu[22] whom Bühler placed between the 2nd cen. B.C. and 2nd cen. A.D.[23] For the *NŚ* also this time-period would appear to be not far from the truth.

Although the *NŚ* does not refer to the *nāgaraka* of the *Kāmaśāstra* as such, its characters of the *Prakaraṇa* approach that image closely. The *Viṭa* in particular is a sophisticated town-dweller. Even though the *NŚ* does not dwell on the city and its life as such, it has an entire chapter on the *Vaiśika*. Now it may be recalled that according to the *Kāmaśāstra*, one version of it was composed by Dattaka, who wrote a separate treatise on the *Vaiśikādhyāya*.[24] Since the treatise of Dattaka no longer exists, it is difficult to say as to what extent the *Vaiśikādhyāya* of the *NŚ* derives from it. In fact, Dattaka is said to have composed his work for the sake of the *gaṇikās* of Pāṭaliputra. It may be presumed that *NŚ* also presupposes the rise of such big cities as Pāṭaliputra became by the 4th cen. B.C. Its geographical, ethnic and social horizons indicate the age of the Indo-Scythians and the Indo-Greeks.

Another consideration important for the dating of the *NŚ* is the fact that it presupposes a well-developed theatre and dramatic performances, as also a highly formalized tradition of dance and music. The antiquity of this tradition provides an earlier limit for a text like the *NŚ*. How old the theatrical tradition was, has been a question much debated by modern scholars. Some modern scholars have attempted to trace the origins of Sanskrit drama to the *Vedas* themselves.[25] The dialogue hymns of the *Vedas* have been considered the source of later drama. There are at least fifteen such dialogue hymns in the *Ṛk Saṁhitā*. Thus, in the first *maṇḍala* we have two hymns (numbered 165 and 170) recalling a dialogue of Indra with the Maruts. In the same *maṇḍala* hymn number 179 contains the famous dialogue of Agastya with Lopāmudrā. In the third *maṇḍala*, the thirty-third hymn has a dialogue of Viśvāmitra with the rivers and in the fourth *maṇḍala*, the eighteenth hymn records a dialogue between Indra, Aditi and Vāmadeva. The 42nd hymn in the same *maṇḍala*, has a dialogue between Indra and Varuṇa. In the 7th *maṇḍala*, the 33rd hymn gives the dialogue between Vasiṣṭha and his sons. In the 9th *maṇḍala*, the 100th hymn has the dialogue of Nema Bhārgava and Indra. The 10th *maṇḍala* has as many as 6 hymns with dialogues. The 10th hymn of this *maṇḍala* records the famous dialogue of Yama and Yamī. The 28th

hymn has the dialogue of the gods with Agni. The 86th hymn is the dialogue of Purūravas and Urvaśī, while the 108th hymn has the dialogue of Saramā and the Paṇis.

Now these dialogues have not been ascribed any ritual use by Sāyaṇa. It has been suggested that some of these dialogues may have been reported or enacted at Vedic sacrifices. Von Schroeder suggested that these dialogue hymns had their origin in Vedic mysteries which went back to Indo-European times.[26] One difficulty with the hypothesis of regarding the dialogue hymns as providing the origin of later drama is that this genre virtually disappears in later Vedic times. Windisch, Oldenberg and Pischel suggested that these dialogue hymns were survivals of ancient epic dialogues with the connective prose eliminated. Thus, both drama and epic may be said to have their source in them.[27] Keith, however, comments that there is no evidence that such a prose-verse mixture existed in the early Vedic hymns.[28]

Thus, although, it is undeniable that the dialogue hymns of the *Ṛgveda* are dramatic and that Vedic ritual also contained dramatic elements such as may be seen in the ritual of *soma*-purchase, the ceremonies of royal consecration and the *Mahāvrata* ceremony, it is not clear that these elements existed in the Vedic religious literature in the form of independent dramatic performances. The dramatic elements in the Vedic ritual or literature connected representation with a direct religious or magical result, not with entertainment. This difference of spirit and purpose between Vedic literature and ritual on the one hand, and classical drama on the other, remained fundamental. It is true that classical drama and even music and dance retained a certain connection with ritual and religious purpose, but they tended to emphasize secular entertainment. That is why the traditional origin of drama as reported in the *NŚ* is that drama began in the *Tretā yuga*, and did not exist in the *Kṛta yuga*. While in creating it Brahmā used elements from the *Vedas*, it is not itself ascribed a Vedic character. It is described as the 'fifth' *Veda* and, thus, is understood to be different in character from the *Vedas*, though seeking to disseminate traditional wisdom along with providing popular entertainment. Earlier, *Itihāsa* has been described as the fifth *Veda*. The application of that title to drama suggests a direct connection with the epics. The connection with the *Vedas* is, indeed, more a claim than a reality because, as Keith pertinently points out, no actual quotations from the *Veda* are offered in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*.

Thus, while the connection of the *NŚ* with the *Vedas* was somewhat remote *via* the *Gāndharva Upaveda* and the use of ritual in dramatic prologues, its connection with the epics and the secular folk-tra-

ditions of mime, dance and music in Vedic ritual as well as of ballads and dialogues in the Vedic literature would themselves point to folk sources. The same elements of art as were current among the folk would be taken up for specialised use and characteristic development by the priests in religious and ritual contexts. As a matter of principle the distinction between the 'sacred' and the 'secular' could only have arisen within a folk context originally. The continuity of folk life as a source of creativity and standardization is not to be regarded as seriously interrupted by the emergence of formalized structures of sacred ritual. Despite the formal distinction of *Veda* and *Loka*, or for that matter, of the ecclesiastical and the pagan in the West, the existence of feed-back mechanism linking the two cannot be wholly denied.

Several scholars in the past advocated a variety of much controverted theories which have now become dated. Thus Hillebrandt and Sten Konow emphasized the secular origin of drama in puppet play. Lüders emphasized the role of shadow plays, Weber and Windisch sought Greek influence and inspiration for Sanskrit drama and pointed specially to the New Attic Comedy. Sylvain Lévi argued for Śaka influence.[29] Most of these theories have been long since criticised as exaggerated and one-sided and they deserve to be discarded for the additional and simple reason that all of them consider the origin of Sanskrit drama to lie in too late a period viz., the period of the Indo-Greeks and the Śakas. Keith holds that there is no real reference to drama in Pāṇini and that even in Patañjali's times there is evidence only of some kind of religious spectacles. If then the origins of classical drama are to be placed between the 2nd century B.C. and the Ist century A.D., it would obviously be necessary to assign a much later date for the *NŚ*. It is for this reason that Keith dates the *NŚ* between Aśvaghoṣa and Kālidāsa.

However, the evidence for the antiquity of drama has been reassessed by several recent Indian scholars. It has been pointed out that already in the Vedic literature we have reference to *śailūṣa*[30] which later meant an actor following the tradition of Śilālin, the author of a *naṭa-sūtra*. This raises the presumption that '*śailūṣa*' may have had a similar meaning in the Vedic texts also. It is true that the explicit mention in this context is only of 'song and dance', '*gītāya śailūṣam*', *nṛttāya śailūṣam*', but then it may be questioned if the Vedic use of *nṛtta* can be given the technical meaning current in later times. '*Naṭa*' itself is sometimes believed to be Prakrtised from *Nṛt* and it is possible that originally *Nṛtta*, *Nṛtya* and *Nāṭya* were all rolled into one. Pāṇini's reference to the *naṭa-sūtras* can only be adequately interpre-

ted in terms of practical hand-books for actors.[31]

The *Arthaśāstra* clearly distinguishes between "actors *(naṭa)*, dancers *(nartaka)*, singers *(gāyakas)*, instrumentalists *(vādakas)*, story-tellers *(vāgjīvana)*, bards *(kuśīlava)*, rope-dancers *(plavaka)*, showmen *(śaubhika)*, and wandering ministrels *(cāraṇas)*."[32] This shows a well developed and differentiated stage of the performing arts. This is confirmed by Kauṭalya's reference to the diverse arts *(kalā)* taught to the women who lived by the stage *(raṅgopajīvinī)*. These include the arts of "singing *(gīta)*, playing on musical instruments *(vādya)*, reciting *(pāṭhya)*, dancing *(nṛtya)*, acting *(nāṭya)*, writing *(akṣara)*, painting *(citra)*, playing on the lute *(vīnā)*, flute *(venu)* and the drum *(mṛdaṅga)*, reading the thoughts of others *(paracittajñāna)*, preparing perfumes and garlands *(gandhamālyasaṁyūhana)*, entertaining by conversation *(saṁvādana)*, shampooing *(saṁvāhana)* and the courtesan's art *(vaiśika-kalā)*."[33] It is clear that even instruction in the diverse theatrical arts had become highly professionalised. The *Nāṭyācārya* or the instructor in theatrical arts was a recognised figure, popular but not approved by Brāhmaṇical orthodoxy. Thus, in the *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra*, being such an instructor *(nāṭyācāryatā)* is condemned as a minor defilement.[34]

The *Mahābhāṣya* refers to the enacted spectacle of the killing of Kaṁsa (by Vāsudeva) and of the binding of Bali (by Vāmana). There were actors *(naṭas)* as also their instructors *(śaubhikas)*, as is brought out by the *Pradīpa* "*śaubhika iti Kaṁsādyanukāriṇāṁ naṭānāṁ vyākhyānopādhyāyāḥ* on the *Mahābhāṣya* text—'*Ye tāvadete śaubhikā nāmaite pratyakṣam Kaṁsam ghātayanti pratyakṣam ca Baliṁ bandhayantīti.*' The spectators *(sāmājikas)* were moved by the spectacles and took sides.[35] These spectacles were not simply religious mimes, but had an aesthetic purpose as is shown decisively by Patañjali's reference to '*rasiko naṭaḥ.*'[36]

An important piece of evidence about the antiquity of drama in India has been furnished by the identification and historical location of Subandhu and *Vāsavadattā*.[37] It is well-known that Vāmana quotes a verse which says that now the youthful son of Candragupta, shining like the moon, has become the king and the patron of the learned. He explains that the patronage of the learned meant that Subandhu became the Counsellor *(Sācivya)*.[38] Some scholars see in this verse a reference to Samudragupta or Kumāragupta as the patron of Vasubandhu. Now, Abhinavagupta in his commentary on the *NŚ* tells us that Mahākavi Subandhu wrote *Vāsavadattānāṭyādhāra* which was a prime example of *nāṭyāyita* or play within a play. Here Bindusāra is made the spectator of a play in which Udayana watches a play with

Vāsavadattā as heroine.[39] Now, a commentary published some time back and called *Kalpalatāviveka*[40] explains with reference to Bhāmaha (4.50) that the writing of Subandhu had been attacked by Viṣṇugupta as unrealistic on five scores and that these objections had been answered. It seems, thus, that the patron of Subandhu was Bindusāra. This confirms what had been known earlier by the *Pariśiṣṭaparvan*, the Jaina *Bṛhatkathākośa* and the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*. Subandhu appears to have been a minister under the last Nanda and the first two Maurya rulers[41] and obviously a rival of Viṣṇugupta, i.e. Kauṭalya or Cāṇakya. The dramatic composition attributed to him indicates by the very complexity of its form a long earlier tradition of drama. The reference to troupes of actors in the *Dīghanikāya* supports this antiquity.[42] In the *Saṁyuttanikāya* it is said that an actoı pleases and amuses the assembled spectators by his speech and acting.[43] With the existence of handbooks for actors *(naṭasūtras)* as attested by Pāṇini even earlier, this should cause no surprise.[44] If then the theatrical tradition clearly existed between Pāṇini and Patañjali, the date of the *NŚ* could well belong to the succeeding two centuries.[45]

NŚ Text and Commentaries

Although the *NŚ* has been edited wholly or partly several times, there can be no doubt that its text remains unsatisfactory as has been pointed out by several scholars.[46] Apart from the defects in the manuscript material, this is also due to the highly technical nature of the text which tended to make it unintelligible occasionally to scribes and editors alike. The greatest single help provided by *Abhinavabhāratī* in this context was itself subject to the difficulty of corrupt manuscripts and perhaps unavoidably imperfect editing. This does not, however, suffice to prove the composite authorship of the work or justify its stratification on impressionistic grounds.[47] As an attempt to provide a comprehensive handbook of traditionally current ideas and practices on a wide range of subjects, the *NŚ* is bound to contain heterogeneity and its material would belong to traditions of varying antiquity. Nevertheless, the work is arranged not in a historical, but rather a systematic manner and hence does not give any adequate clues about the evolution of its concepts, except that Abhinavagupta occasionally points out such differences. Under the circumstances, the *NŚ* has to be treated as representing an age of classic systematisation which sums up earlier traditions and stands at the head of subsequent developments. Thus, in drama it presupposes the numerous types of *rūpakas* and their formal analyses but the systematisation of *uparūpakas* came later. In music, it presupposes the full development of the *Gāndharva* system but gives currency to theatrical

music from which the subsequent development of the *rāga* system took place. In aesthetics, it produced the celebrated formula of *rasa*, which was at once descriptive and evaluative, but it became the starting point of later aesthetic ideas. Its concept of *rasa*, despite interpolations was confined to only eight *rasas*. Many other *rasas* were conceived of in later times.[48] While it shows much development in metrics, its rhetoric is relatively redumentary. In the analyses of dance movements and gestures, it presents a well-nigh perfected grammar leaving for posterity only the development of special and complex dance forms which combined pure dancing into musical operas.

Apart from Bharata several authors have been mentioned in the *NŚ*. Not only the mythical Sadāśiva and Brahmā, we also find the names of Nandi, Kohala, Vātsya, Śāṇḍilya and Dhūrtila.[49] Abhinava has many references to the authority of Kohala. Taṇḍu or Nandi is mentioned as a celebrated master of dance while Svāti and Nārada are mentioned in the context of music especially. It has been suggested that Dhūrtila or Dhūrtita is a mistake for Dattila who has been mentioned in the *NŚ* in the company of Śāṇḍilya, Vatsa and Kohala.[50] Dattila appears to have been an authority on *Gāndharva* and coeval with but independent of Bharata.[51] He refers to Nārada, Viśākhila and Kohala. Nandi is sometimes identified with Nandikeśvara without much cogency.[52]

The value of the *NŚ* as a source for the study of ancient Indian culture is matched only by the difficulties which stand in the way of its full utilization. The work is encylcopaedic in character,[53] but written for the most part in the highly technical language of the performing arts of a long vanished age. That a certain reconstruction of its contents is possible, is only because of the continuity of the ancient tradition reflected in theatrical writings primarily and to some extent in the practical tradition. A number of ancient authors wrote commentaries on the *NŚ*—Bhaṭṭodbhaṭṭa, Lollaṭa, Mātṛgupta, Śaṅkuka, Bhaṭṭanāyaka, Bhaṭṭayantra and Abhinavagupta. Unfortunately, except for the last, all the earlier commentaries have been lost. Abhinavagupta occasionally quotes the views of earlier commentators. He himself wrote late in the 10th century in Kashmir and was, as is well-known, a celebrated mystic, philosopher and a versatile scholar. His explanations constitute the most valuable key to the unlocking of the *NŚ*, especially of its sections dealing with music and aesthetics. The works of Dattila, Mātaṅga and Śārṅgadeva, too, are of great importance in this context. So are the works of later dramaturgists and rhetoricians. The *Kāmasūtra*, the *Manusmṛti*, the early classical dra-

matists and poets like Bhāsa, Aśvaghoṣa, Kālidāsa, Śūdraka and Hāla too, are relevant to the understanding of the *NŚ* as they illustrate the tradition of dramatic practice and atmosphere proximate to it. The sculptures of Śuṅga, Sātavāhana, Śaka and Kuṣāṇa ages, occasionally provide telling illustrations of ornaments, dress, social character etc. which may be found in the *NŚ*. This is, however, only incidental because the *NŚ* is a technical summary of the performing arts rather than the visual arts of the ages.

Footnotes

1 *NŚ* (GOS ed.), Vol. I, preface, p. 57.
2 *AB*, prefatory verses on *NŚ*, 1.2.
3 *AB*, Vol. I, p. 9.
4 Bahurūpa Miśra on *Daśarūpaka*, 1, 62.
5 *Bhāvaprakāśana*, 10, 34-35.
6 *Yamalāṣṭakatantra*, quoted by Ram Krishna Kavi, *NŚ*, preface, p. 58, fn. 1.
7 *AB*, Vol. I, p. 9.
8 *Ibid.*, p. 8.
9 *Amarakośa*, 2, 10, 12.
10 *AB*, I, p. 9.
11 According to Abhinava, Bharata quotes the *Āryās* of his predecessors—*AB*, I, p. 358.
12 H.P. Shastri, *JASB*, 1913, placed the *NŚ* in the 2nd cen. B.C.; S. Lévi places it in the Indo-Scythian period (*IA*, Vol. 33); A.B. Keith places it about the 3rd cen. A.D. (*Sanskrit Drama*, p. 13); Manmohan Ghosh argued for the period between 100 B.C. and 200 A.D. (*JDL*, Vol. 25), though in his translation of the *NŚ* he argued for 500 B.C.
13 *NŚ*, Vol. I, preface, pp. 14-15. Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 21.
In the *Vikramorvaśīya* (2, 18) we have a direct reference to the Sage Bharata and the tradition of his staging a dramatic play :
'*Muninā Bharatena yaḥ prayogo bhavatīṣvaṣṭarasāśrayaḥ prayuktaḥ/ Lalitābhinayaṁ tam adya bhartā marutām draṣṭumanāḥ sa lokapālaḥ//*
The reference to '*eight rasas*' and to '*lalitābhinaya*' also underscores the connection with Bharata. In the *Mālavikāgnimitra* (1, 4) a well-known verse has been regarded as a virtual summary of the leading ideas of the *NŚ*—
"*Devānām idam āmananti munayaḥ kāntaṁ kratuṁ cākṣuṣam Rudreṇedamumākṛtavyaktikare svāṅge vibhaktaṁ dvidhā/ Traiguṇyodbha-*

vaṁ atra lokacaritam nānārasaṁ dṛśyate Nāṭyam bhinnarucerjanasya bahudhāpyekaṁ Samārādhanam//In the *Kumārasambhava* (7, 91) we have reference to the technical concepts of *Sandhis*, *Vṛttis*, *Rasa and Lalitāṅgahāra*—"*Tau Sandhiṣu Vyañjitavṛttibhedaṁ rasāntaresu pratibaddharāgam*/*Apaśyatām apsarasām muhūrtam prayogam ādyam lalitāṅgahāram*//In the *Raghuvaṁśa* (19, 36), again, we have "*Aṅgasattvavacanāśrayaṁ mithaḥ strīṣu nṛtyam upadhāya darśayan*" which has technical echoes of the *NŚ*.

14a Abhinava mentions a Vārtikakāra of the *NŚ* and this Vārtikakāra is named Harṣa-Vikrama by Sāgaranandin in *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa* and by Śāradātanaya in *Bhāvaprakāśana*. Kalhaṇa associates King Harṣa Vikramāditya with the poet Mātṛgupta (Keith, A.B., *Sanskrit Drama*, p. 29; Bhaduri, *JBRS*, VI, pp. 218 ff.).

14b Cf. Śārṅgadeva in *SR* (1.19) :
'*Vyākhyātāro Bhāratīye Lollaṭodbhaṭa-Śaṅkukāḥ*/
Bhaṭṭābhinavaguptāśca śrīmatkīrtidharo' *paraḥ*//

15 See Dasgupta and De, *History of Sanskrit Literature;* Keith, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 382-83; Kane, *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, pp. 78 ff.

16 Keith, *Sanskrit Drama*, p. 292.

17 *NŚ*, Vol. II, p. 377. The reference to Nepāla and Mahārāṣṭra cannot be said to indicate a date not earlier than Samudragupta as argued by D.C. Sircar (*JAHRS*, XII); cf. Kane, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

18 *NŚ*, Vol. II, p. 161. Cf. Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, 2nd ed., p. 232; Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, 5th ed., p. 433.

19 *NŚ*, Vol. II, p. 127.

20 *Ibid.*, pp. 18, 100.

21 *Ibid.*, pp. 12, 28 '*Devāṁśajāstu rājāno*'

22 *Manusmṛti*, 7, 5.

23 Bühler, *Manu* (S.B.E.).

24 *Kāmasūtras*, I. 1. 11.

25 S. Lévi, *Theatre indien;* L. Von Schroeder, *Mysterium and Mimus in Ṛgveda;* Sten Konow, *Das indische Drama*. Keith (*op. cit.*) discusses these views at length and Dasgupta and De (*op. cit.*) tend to follow him.

26 Von Schroeder, *op. cit.*, cited by Keith, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

27 Keith, *op. cit.*, pp. 23 ff.

28 *Ibid.*, *l.c.*

29 *Ibid.*, *l.c.*; Dasgupta and De, *op. cit.*, pp. 44 ff.

30 *Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā*, 30. 6; *Tai. Brā.*, 3, 4, 21.

31 *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, 4, 3, 110.

32 *Arthaśāstra*, 2, 27, 25, translated by R.P. Kangle, Vol. II, p. 161.
33 *Ibid.*, 2, 27, 28.
34 *Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtras*, 2, 25.
35 *Mahābhāṣya* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, 3, 1, 26.
36 *Ibid.* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, 5, 2, 95; *Kāśikā* mentions *bhāvayogyatā*—apropos '*rasiko naṭaḥ*'.
37 Krishnamurthi, *Indian Literary Theories*, pp. 105 ff. Cf. K.A.N. Sastri (ed.), *Age of the Nandas and Mauryas*, pp. 329-30.
38 Vāmana, *Kāvyālaṁkārasūtravṛtti*, 3, 2, 2.
39 *AB* on *NŚ*, 22, 48; *NŚ*, III, p. 172.
40 Published by L.D. Institute, Ahemdabad.
41 K.A.N. Sastri, *l.c.*
42 Cf. Wijesekera, 'Buddhist Evidence for the Early Existence of Drama', *IHQ*, XVII, pp. 196-206. Cf. Tarlekar, *Studies in the Nāṭyaśāstra*, p. 8.
43 *SN* (PTS ed.), IV, p. 306.
44 Vide, *supra*.
45 Cf. Byrski, *Concept of Ancient Indian Theatre*, 1974, p. 37.
46 Eg. Kane, *op. cit.*, pp. 12ff.; Mukund Lath, *A Study of Dattilam*, p. 753. Visvesvara Shastri, *Abhinavabhāratī*, Intro., p. 50; *NŚ*, I, p. 20 (GOS, 2nd ed.).
47 As attempted, for example, by Kane, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
48 See, *infra*.
49 *Sāṇḍilyaṁ caiva Vatsaṁ ca Kohalaṁ Dattilaṁ tathā*, *NŚ*, I, 26.
||Kohalādibhirevaṁ tu Vatsaśāṇḍilyadhūrtilaiḥ|
...Etacchāstram praṇītam hi narāṇām buddhivardhanam||
—*Ibid.*, 37, 25-36.
50 Lath, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
51 *Ibid.*, *l.c.*
52 V. Shastri, *op. cit.*, Intro.
53 Cf. *NŚ*, 21 122 : *Na tajjñānaṁ na tacchilpaṁ na sā vidyā na sa kalā|*
Na tat karma na yogo'sau nāṭake yan na dṛśyate ||

Chapter 2

Ancient Indian Theatre as Reflected in the Nāṭyaśāstra

The antiquity of Indian drama and theatre is, as discussed in Chapter 1, uncertain. While dramatic elements can certainly be discovered in the Vedic literature, it is difficult to say that there was any formalised, distinct recognition of drama at that time. Folk mimes and dialogues accompanied with dance and music may be presumed to have existed because these elements are found in some Vedic rituals. At the same time, *naṭas* or actor-acrobats were certainly known in the later Vedic age because they figured in the sacrificial list of the *puruṣamedha* found in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.*[1] In Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, one hears of *naṭa-sūtras.*[2] It may, therefore, be presumed that handbooks of the histrionic art were already known to Pāṇini. Theatrical troupes with distinct professional expertise must, therefore, have existed in some form. The *sūtras* mention the profession of a theatrical coach *(nāṭyācāryatā).*[3] The *Arthaśāstra* also mentions wandering groups of actors as also the professional coaching of the arts of those who live by the stage *(raṅgopajīvin).*[4] In the *Mahābhāṣya* the existence of dramatic representations is quite clear.[5] We also find that a cave in the Ramgarh hills in Madhya Pradesh probably served the purpose of a stage in about the second century B.C.[6] Thus, between Pāṇini and Patañjali, i.e. between the 5th and the 2nd centuries B.C., there certainly existed troupes of actors, handbooks for them and some kind of stage and shows. If this evidence is combined with the plausible historicity of Subandhu and his *Vāsavadattānāṭyadhārā*, it would indicate a developed dramatic tradition by the 4th century B.C.[7]

Prof. Keith has suggested that dramatic performance were probably enacted in palaces or temples without any regular or permanent buildings constructed as theatres.[8] This state might have existed in very early times, but it had been overcome by the time of Bharata. Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* visualises definite types of theatres with well-developed conventions regarding their construction. Although between the 2nd century B.C. and the 2nd century A.D , the Indo-Greeks and Śakas ruled over parts of northern and western India, neither the theory of Weber and Windisch[9] about Greek influence,

appears plausible now, nor that of Sylvain Lévi and Konow about Śaka influence.[10] The *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata presupposes a long and indigenous tradition.

The broad outline of the architecture of the theatre *(nāṭyamaṇḍapa)* is clear enough. Three different forms of the theatrical hall are visualised. It could be rectangular, square or triangular.[11] The sizes could be big, middling or small.[12] Generally, the hall was conceived as two-storeyed, which apparently meant that the elevation of the theatre had the appearance of being divided into two storeys.[13] The stage occupied the western half of the dramatic hall. The eastern half consisted of the auditorium. At the back of the western-most end of the stage was located the green room or *nepathya*.[14] Its length was half of the stage *(raṅga)*,[15] which itself appears to have been divided into two parts, namely, *raṅgaśīrṣa* and *raṅgapīṭha*, the former being to the west of the latter which was not so elevated.[16] It has, however, been suggested that *raṅgaśīrṣa* and *raṅgapīṭha* were identical.[17] The green room was separated from the *raṅgaśīrṣa* by a curtain and a central pillar though some scholars have suggested that the curtain was between *raṅgaśīrṣa* and *raṅgapīṭha*.[18] The *nepathya* was connected with the *raṅgaśīrṣa* by two doors, one on each side of the pillars.[19] In front of the pillars was located the orchestra or the *kutapa*.[20] On both sides of the *raṅgapīṭha* and projecting beyond the walls of the hall stood two ornamental *verandahs* or *mattavāraṇī*.[21] Some scholars have, however, suggested that *mattavāraṇī* was a continuous frieze of elephants along the elevation of the *raṅgapīṭha*.[22]

The eastern half of the hall was built as an auditorium with tiers of elevated seats.[23] Many ornamentally constructed pillars studded the building.[24] The ceilling was apparently shaped like the vault of a cave, which implied a gable roof.[25] There were distinct entrances for the actors and the audience.[26] The columns and the walls were decorated and painted.[27] The openings were arranged with reference to sound accoustics.

As mentioned earlier, the general idea of the dramatic hall is clear enough. Sharp controversies, however, plague the interpretation of various points in the text of the *NŚ*. Abhinavagupta himself mentions diverse interpretations at places. Some have even suggested that Abhinavagupta did not have any living theatrical tradition before him.[28] The principal controversies may be listed as follows. 1) The determination of the dimensions of the permissible types of shapes; 2) the meaning of *raṅgapīṭha* in relation to *raṅgaśīrṣa*; 3) the location of *yavanikā*; 4) the meaning of *mattavāraṇī;* 5) the meaning of *ṣaḍdāruka*; 6) the placement of the pillars; 7) the meaning of *dvi-*

bhūmika and *guhākāra*; and 8) the partition of seats. Dr. Mankad, M.M. Ghosh, Dr. Raghavan, Dr. Subbarao and Visvesvara Shastri are the principal names of scholars who have expressed divergent views on one or more of these questions.[29]

The verses 7 to 11 of the second chapter of Bharata run as follows: "The wise Viśvakarman having seen the theatre conceived it in accordance with *śāstra*, as having a three-fold plan *(trividhaḥ sanniveśaḥ)*. The theatre *(maṇḍapa)* may be rectangular *(vikṛṣṭa)*, square *(caturasra)* or triangular *(trayasra)*. Their measures *(pramāṇāni)* may be large, middling and small. These measures are prescribed as based on *hastadaṇḍa* and are of 108 *hastas*, 64 *hastas* and 32 *hastas*. The large measure is of 108, the middling one of 64 and the smallest of 32 *hastas*. The large is meant for the gods, the middling for the kings and the smallest for other people." Ābhinava furnishes some explanations. He says the large, middling and small measures are based on measurement in terms of *hastadaṇḍa*, not on the shapes of the theatre—"*Pramāṇam hastadaṇḍāśrayaṁjyeṣṭhaditvaṁ na tu sanniveśāśrayamiti vāvat.*"[30] Secondly, he comments that these diverse shapes and sizes are mentioned only to continue the old tradition according to which there are eighteen types. Practically, not all of them are useful.[31] Thirdly, he points out that the reference to gods, men and other beings is a reference to plays of different types, where the hero and the villains come from these classes. Abhinava rejects the rival contention that here gods etc. are intended for spectators, not characters. He gives the examples of the *dima* for the large sized (theatre), *nāṭaka* etc. for the middle-sized (theatre) and *bhāṇa*, *prahasana* etc. for the small-sized (theatre).[32]

The text goes on to mention that a *daṇḍa* consists of four *hastas*, while the *hasta* consists of twenty-four fingers or eighteen inches. According to Abhinava, the eighteen possible types include nine measured in *hastas* and nine measured in *daṇḍas*. Nine possibilities arise from the combination of three shapes in three sizes each.[33] Thus, *vikṛṣṭa* could be *jyeṣṭha*, *madhyama* and *avara;* and similarly would be *caturasra* and *tryasra*. 1) *Vikṛṣṭa jyeṣṭha* would be 108 × 64 *hastas*; 2) *Vikṛṣṭa madhyama* would be 64 × 32 *hastas*; 3) *Vikṛṣṭa avara* would be 32 × 16 (?) *hastas*; 4) *Caturasra jyeṣṭha* would be 108 × 108; 5) *Caturasra madhyama* would be 64 × 64; 6) *Caturasra avara* would be 32 × 32; 7) *Tryasra jyeṣṭha* would be an equilateral triangle with one side equal to 108 *hastas*; so *Tryasra madhyama* would have a side of 64 *hastas* and *Tryasra avara* would have a side of 32 *hastas*.

In understanding this classification, one must decide on two of

Abhinava's interpretations at the outset. Is the reference to gods, men and others a reference to spectators or plays having these as principal characters? Some modern critics like Subbarao have assumed the former, whereas Abhinava had rejected this view. If Abhinava's interpretation is not accepted, the *NŚ* would appear to have been meant as much for the gods and other creatures as for men. This does not appear to have been the case. Similarly, *hasta-daṇḍa* can only mean *hasta* and *daṇḍa*. Prof. Subbarao's interpretation of *daṇḍa* as a measuring rod seems to have no justification.[34]

Prof. Subbarao says that *Vikṛtṣa jyeṣṭha*, being for gods is not relevant for men, and that *Vikṛṣṭa avara* is impossible because there cannot be any dimension less than 32. He also rejects *Caturasra jyeṣṭha* because it would be larger than *Vikṛṣṭa jyeṣṭha*, which would contradict *caturasra* being a *madhyama* shape. This is based on Bharata's verse 10, where 108 *hastas* are called *jyeṣṭha*, 64 as *madhyama* and 32 as *kanīyas*. From this, it does not follow that *caturasra* is *madhyama*, —'*caturasram tu madhyamam*.' However, Prof. Subbarao appeals to the eliminated verse 3 after verse 11, where it is said that the smallest size is triangular, the square is the middling and the *jyeṣṭha* is *vikṛṣṭa*. The authenticity of these verses is itself debatable. Since, *Caturasra madhyama* would be longer than the *Vikṛṣṭa madhyama*, Subbarao rejects this also as impossible. *Caturasra avara* he deems feasible, and thus concludes that only three shapes and sizes are permissible for men namely, *Vikṛṣṭa madhyama* (64 × 32), *Caturasra avara* (32 × 32), and *Tryasra avara* (32 × 32 × 32).[35]

Dr. Mankad[36] had already suggested that the measures of the 3 shapes commence with 108, 64 and 32 *hastas*, so that *Vikṛṣṭa* becomes *jyeṣṭha*, *Caturasra madhyama* and *Tryasra* becomes *avara*. The result is that *Vikṛṣṭa madhyama* would be 64 × 32 and *Caturasra madhyama* would be 32 × 32. This suggestion was meant to resolve a peculiar difficulty in Bharata's classification. On the one hand, it recommends in verses 17-21 that of all the theatres (*prekṣāgṛhas*), the middling or *madhyama* is the best. This apparently is of the dimension 64 × 32 *hastas*. Beyond this size, the appearances of the characters would become indistinct and the voices would be distorted. In the middling size, the accoustic qualities are the best. From this it follows, that just as *Vikṛṣṭa madhyama* is illustrated by verse 17 as measuring 64 × 32 *hastas*, similarly, the *Caturasra madhyama*, being 64 × 64 ought to be prescribed for the *caturasra* shape. But, actually in verse 86, the model size for *caturasra* is prescribed as 32 × 32. This appears to be contradictory. Thus, instead of picking up on 64 × 64 as the ideal *madhyama* of square shapes, Bharata

actually picks up 32×32 as the ideal *caturasra* which is not *madhyama*. To explain this, Dr. Mankad has supposed that the measurement for *Caturasra* should begin with 64 and not 108. Measurement will begin for 108 in the case of *Vikṛṣṭa* which is *jyeṣṭha*, and with 64 in the case of *Caturasra*.

The fact is that Bharata does not regard any particular shape as inherently *jyeṣṭha*, *modhyama* or *avara*. Abhinava has made this quite clear. Despite the 9 or 18 possible types Bharata has stipulated that the maximum size should be 64×32. He has given details of two types—*vikṛṣṭa* measuring 64×32 and *caturasra* measuring 32×32. It will be noticed that the area of this *caturasra* is one half of the prescribed *Vikṛṣṭa*. As for the *tryasra*, no precise measurement is given. Since, the equilateral triangle with sides of 32 *hastas* will have precisely half of the area of the prescribed *caturasra*, perhaps that is the appropriate triangular size. Shri Visvesvara Shastri has suggested[37] that *Caturasra madhyama* of 64×64 would be longer than the prescribed maximum of 64×32. So Bharata prescribed only 32×32 as the proper size for a square shape.

Although the reference to gods, men and others could not be for stages where gods etc. constitute the spectators, to say that different types of stages and theatres are required for different types of plays is also not free from difficulty. How could stages and theatres be changed for different types of plays? It may be suggested that a theatre for gods probably meant a theatre connected with the temple. Similarly, a theatre for kings probably meant the theatre connected with the royal palace and one for the common man *(śeṣā prakṛti)* probably meant a popular peoples' theatre.

According to Bharata's directions, the theatre is to be divided into two equal parts along its length—the stage and the auditorium—then the stage itself is divided into two equal parts, again along its length-the backward or western portion consisting of the *nepathyagṛha* or the green-room. In *NŚ* 2, 34, the second or the forward half of the stage is termed *raṅgaśirṣa*. In verse 62, Bharata goes on to say "then (i.e. after the construction of *mattavāraṇī*) the *raṅgapīṭha* is to be constructed according to the prescribed method. But *raṅgaśirṣa* is to be constructed as having *ṣaḍdāruka*." The use of the particle '*tu*' here in '*raṅgaśirṣam tu*' clearly shows that *raṅgapīṭha* and *raṅgaśirṣa* are different. In his commentary on verse 34, Abhinava says that the stage minus the green-room should be divided into two parts each consisting of 8 *hastas*. One of them is called *raṅgaśirṣa*, the other *raṅgapīṭha*.[38] Of these, *raṅgapīṭha* is directly in front of the, audience and is the place where most actions are represented; *raṅgaśirṣa* is the

back where the orchestra takes its place. Abhinavagupta gives the analogy of a person lying on his back so that his body is in front and the head at the back. The latter is apparently comparable to *raṅgaśīrṣa*.

M.M. Ghosh, in an article in the *IHQ* 1933, while criticising Mankad's article in the same journal in the previous year, expressed the view that *raṅgapīṭha* and *raṅgaśīrṣa* are two names of the same thing. He has, besides, tried to argue that three-fourth of the hall should be for the audience and only one-fourth for *nepathya* and *raṅgapīṭha*. His arguments are : 1) In the first chapter of the *NŚ* (vv.90,95), while *raṅgapīṭha* is mentioned, *raṅgaśīrṣa* is not. 2) In the second chapter verses 32-33 mention *raṅgaśīrṣa*, but not *raṅgapīṭha*. Again, in verses 72, 73 and 75, only *raṅgaśīrṣa* is mentioned and not *raṅgapīṭha*. Again in verses 102-104 of chapter 2 only *raṅgapīṭha* is mentioned and not *raṅgaśīrṣa*. Then in verses 88-101 of the same chapter, while *raṅgapīṭha* is mentioned four times, *raṅgaśīrṣa* is mentioned only once and there we have a variant reading, *raṅgapīṭha* in place of *raṅgaśīrṣa*.

While Abhinavagupta places the curtain or *yavanikā* between *raṅgapīṭha* and *raṅgaśīrṣa*,[39] M.M. Ghosh rejects it and places the curtain between *nepathya* and the *raṅgaśīrṣa*. Prof. Subbarao describes the *raṅgapīṭha* as the stage block and the *raṅgaśīrṣa* as the upper surface of the stage. He says that the *raṅgapīṭha* is the base of the *raṅga*, just as the *raṅgaśīrṣa* is the top of the upper surface of the *raṅga* or stage. *Raṅgapīṭha* is, therefore, the entire block of the stage having *raṅgaśīrṣa* on its upper surface. The *raṅgaśīrṣa* is to rest on *ṣaḍdāruka*, which Subbarao takes to mean 'braced frames'.[40]

In examining these different views and arguments one conclusion which is unmistakable is that Abhinavagupta clearly distinguished between *raṅgapīṭha* and *raṅgaśīrṣa*; therefore to abolish this distinction one requires positive and powerful evidence. Mere presumption cannot be sufficient to discard Abhinava's positive statements.

As regards the position of the *yavanikā* or curtain, we have already mentioned two views—Abhinava's view that it stood between the *raṅgapīṭha* and the *raṅgaśīrṣa* and Dr. Ghosh's view that it separated the *nepathya* from the *raṅgaśīrṣa*. Keith also supposes that the curtain (*paṭi*, *apaṭi*, *tiraskaraṇī*, *pratisīrā*) to which the name *yavanikā* or *javanikā* was given stood behind the stage (i.e. in front of the *nepathya*). He argues that when the characters enter hastily, the curtain is said to be violently thrown aside—*apaṭīkṣepa*. Prof. Keith also argues that the name *yavanikā* denotes that its material was foreign,

and forbids any conclusion as to the Greek origin of the curtain itself.[41]

In view of the fact that entry from the *napathya* to *raṅgaśīrṣa* was regularly through two doors and the orchestra stood between them against a central pillar, it does not seem that the division of the *nepathya* and *raṅgaśīrṣa* was by a curtain. On the other hand, Abhinava's suggestion would simply mean that the actors entered the *raṅgapīṭha* by tossing aside the curtain. At the same time, however, this position of the curtain would muffle the orchestra unless one supposes that the curtain was removed after the commencement of the action. Abhinavagupta described *raṅgaśīrṣa* as the inner place for the entering characters—"*praviśatām pātrāṇāṁ ca antassthānam.*"[42]

There is considerable controversy on the relative heights of the stage, the auditorium, and the different parts of the stage. Dr. M.M. Ghosh suggests that the stage should be lower than the auditorium. On the other hand, Abhinavagupta interprets Bharata to mean that the stage including *raṅgaśīrṣa* and *nepathya* should be one and a half *hastas* higher than the *auditorium.*[43] He says that the *raṅgapīṭha* has to have the same height as *mattavāraṇī*, which is to be constructed with a height of a hand and a half. Thus *raṅgapīṭha* becomes one and a half *hastas* higher than the ground floor (*bradhnabhū-bhāga*). He adds that the reason for this is to prevent the obstruction of the *raṅagpīṭha* by the *mattavāraṇī.* Thus, *raṅgapīṭha* is slightly higher than the auditorium, and *raṅgapīṭha.* In *NŚ* 2, 62, it has been laid down that the *raṅgaśīrṣa* is to be filled with black earth free from impurities. This is obviously intended to raise the level of the *raṅgaśīrṣa.* This surface of the *raṅgaśīrṣa* is to be plain like the surface of a pure mirror, not like the back of a tortoise nor that of a fish.[44] Prof. Subbarao explains '*kūrmapṛṣṭha*' and '*matsyapṛṣṭha*' as convex and concave respectively.

Dr. Ghosh, Dr. Mankad and most western scholars hold the *raṅgapīṭha* to be lower than the *nepathya.* Dr. Weber is an exception.[45] Weber argued from '*ni-patha*' which denotes a descending way and hence *nepathya* should be lower than the stage. Keith, however, argues that the recurring phrase about the descent of actors on stage (*raṅgāvataraṇa*) suggests that the stage is lower than the *nepathya.* This can easily be reconciled with Abhinava's statement that *raṅgaśīrṣa* is a kind of vestibule (*antassthānam*) for the actors. They enter the *raṅgapīṭha* from the *raṅgaśīrṣa* and if the latter is slightly higher than the former, the idea of descent is easily understood. It may be added that the derivation of *nepathya* remains uncertain.

It may be recalled that the *raṅgaśīrṣa* was declared to rest on

ṣaḍdāruka.[46] Abhinava explains *ṣaḍdāruka* as consisting of a certain arrangement of columns between the *raṅgaśīrṣa* and *nepathya.* "In front of the wall of the *nepathya-gṛha* (*bhitti*), there are to be two columns at a distance of eight *hastas.* Then on each side of these two columns there will be two other columns one on each side of the earlier columns at a distance of 4 *hastas* each. These 4 columns along with the joining beams on top and below form six timbers which collectively are called *ṣaḍdārukam.* The purpose of it is beauty of construction. Then two doors are to be made of the *nepathyagṛha,* one to the south and one to the north. These doors are to have curvilinear heads or lintels in the shape of arches. Thus, the *raṅgaśīrṣa* is for the beauty of the stage, for the concealing of the entrance of the actors and providing rest to them. Some others say that *ṣaḍdāruka* is the same as *Acchapata* (*? tridvāraka*), consisting of the two pillars adorned by timbers on the two sides above and below. Some others say that *ṣaḍdāruka* consists of the following six viz. *ūha,* which is the timber, extending far away from the capital of the column, *pratyūha* or the balancing timber on top of that, *niryūha* consisting of the part projecting out from the ends of the *pratyūha* or the balancing timber on top of that, *niryūha* consisting of the part projecting out from the ends of the *pratyūhas* and joining with the wall, *sañjavanaphalakas* which project from the *niryūha, anubandha* or decorations on the columns like lions, mythical serpents etc. and *kuharas* or representations of mountains, towns, groves, caves, etc. These six (elements) constitute *Ṣaḍdāruka.* In all the alternatives, there have to be two doors for the movement of the actors"[47]

In all these three interpretations of *ṣaḍdāruka* as given by Abhinava, *Ṣaḍdāruka* represents a group of columns and their elements in particular arrangements. These are, in other words, decorative elements on the *raṅgaśīrṣa.* Against this Prof. Subbarao has given a wholly new interpretation of *saḍdāruka.* He believes that the *raṅgaśīrṣa* has to be strongly supported, and for this support, cross-braced frames need to be provided. These are called *ṣaḍdāruka.* Such a support will neutralise the reversal of stress created by movements of actors on the *raṅgaśīrṣa.*[48] This interpretation, however, totally disagrees with that of Abhinava.

Bharata says that on the side of the *raṅgapīṭha* should be constructed the *mattavāraṇī* with four pillars in accordance with the size of the *raṅgapīṭha.* The *mattavāraṇī* is to be constructed with a height of one and a half *hastas.* The height of the two should be the same as the *raṅgapīṭha.* Abhinava says that the word *pārśve* without qualification and the phrase 'equal to those two' which indicates a dual

number, togethe1 show that the reference is to the future two sides.[49] The four columns are held projecting out of the stage. Thus, two pillars will be outside the wall of the stage and then beyond the wall, two others at a distance of 8 *hastas*. Thus, we get a square with sides of 8 *hasta*s, and formed by four columns projecting outside the wall of the *raṅga*. Those who think that *mattavāraṇī* ought to be rectangular will have its dimensions as 16 × 8 *hastas*. Thus, on Abhinava's view *mattavāraṇī* represents a pair of four columns on each side of the stage, outside the wall of the *raṅgapīṭha*.

The meaning of the word *mattavāraṇī* itself requires some interpretation. In the dictionaries the meaning of the word *mattavāraṇa* is given as a *verandah* of a special kind. It has even been suggested that *mattavāraṇī* is a mistake for *mattavāraṇau*, but the suggestion runs counter to Abhinava's text.[50]

Modern interpreters have, however, tended to place *mattavāraṇī* within the stage itself. Thus M.M. Ghosh makes the *mattavāraṇī* on both sides of the *raṅgapīṭha* extend up to the wall. Prof. Subbarao has suggested a wholly novel view. He purposes that *mattavāraṇī* is a single entity, being in the singular. He supposes that *mattavāraṇī* is a frieze of elephants depicted on the audience-facing elevation of the stage.[51] Another view, expressed by Prof. Bhanu, is that *mattavāraṇī* is a kind of railing which is in front of the *raṅgapīṭha* to prevent spectators from rushing on to the stage.[52]

The most surprising thing about the *mattavāraṇī* is the unfamiliarity of the word itself. In the *Kuṭṭanīmatam*, the word *mattavāraṇa* is used, but, there its sense may not be technical at all. The most significant use is found in the *Vāsavadattā* of Subandhu, where we find '*mattavāraṇayor varaṇḍakena*'.[53] Here also the form is *mattavāraṇa*' but the connection with *verandah* seems to be clear. '*Mattavāraṇī* or *mattavāraṇa*, thus, seems to be a projecting and elevated element at the same height as the *raṅgapīṭha* and on both sides of it, constructed by means of four pillars on each side. The alternative to this is to regard it as some kind of railing, or frieze on the railing.

Bharata makes it clear that after measurements are completed (*māna-vidhi*), the construction begins by placing the bricks (*iṣṭikāsthāpana*).[54] Bharata here speaks of the construction of the hall (*maṇḍapasya niveśanam*). If Abhinava is right, this construction is obviously of a permanent nature. After *sthāpanā*, Bharata prescribes the construction of the walls (*bhittikarman*). Abhinava adds that *māna-vidhi*, *sthāpana-vidhi* and *bhitti-vidhi* are successive. In verse 44, Bharata prescribes that the columns should be fixed after the walls have been completed. Abhinava explains that here, *sthāpana* (of the

pillars) means their elevation. Apparently, there were four principal pillars on the four corners. The *brāhmaṇa stambha* is apparently to be placed at the south-eastern corner, the *kṣatriya* pillar in the south-western corner, the *vaiśya* pillar in the north-western corner and the *śūdra* pillar in the north-eastern corner. The position of the *vaiśya stambha* and *śūdra stambha* is given explicitly in the *NŚ*.[55] The position of the *brāhmaṇa stambha* is given by Abhinava as '*īśāna koṇa*' which is the south- eastern corner. In fixing the pillars, several faults are to be avoided so that the pillars are immovable (*acala*), unshakable (*akampya*), and unturnable (*avalita*). Faults in these respects were held to indicate calamities.[56] The pillars were required to be as immovable as the Himalayas and bring victory to the king. After this, as explained, *mattavāraṇīs* were to be constructed on the sides of the *raṅgapīṭha* and *raṅgaśīrṣa* was to be constructed along with the *ṣaḍdāruka*. This also involved the two doors of the *nepathya*. The floor of the *raṅgaśīrṣa* was to be polished. After the *raṅgaśīrṣa* was constructed, then woodwork (*dārukarma*) was done. The woodwork or *kāṣṭha-vidhi* involved various types of ornamental works on the pillars or special constructions made out of these. These include *ūha*, *pratyūha*, *sañjavana*, *vyāla*, *śālabhañjikā*, *nirvyūha*, *kuhara*, *vedikā*, *vinyāsa*, *citra-jāla* and *gavākṣa*, *pīṭhadhāriṇī* and *kapotālī*.[57] Several of these like *ūha*, *pratyūha*, *niryūha*, *kuhara*, and *sañjavana* have been explained by Abhinava in the context of *ṣaḍdāruka*. *Vyāla* seems to be the same as *anubandha* in the *ṣaḍdāruka*, referring to carving of beasts. *Śālabhañjikā* is charming wooden images.[58] *Vedikā* generally had the sense of decorated railings as at Bharhut and Sanchi. Abhinavagupta calls it '*caturasrikā*', but he clearly says that they are decorated by many forms. *Citrajāla* is a variegated lattice, which has square octogonal holes. *Gavākṣas* are lattices with circular holes. *Vinyāsa* obviously has the sense of disposition or arrangement of elements. *Pīṭhadhāriṇī* has been explained by Abhinava as the balancing projection above the pillars. *Kapotālī* refers to a dove-cot.[59]

After wood-work, the walls are to be completed. It is laid down that brackets (*nāgadanta*), windows, corners and minor doors should not have doors opposite to them. This restriction on cross-ventilation is for accoustic purposes.[60] Abhinava explains that *nāgadanta* here refers to the bracket on a pillar which holds an image. He gives an alternative name for this, viz., *gajamukha*.

Bharata then goes on, in the same verse (2.80), to say that the theatre, *nāṭya-maṇḍapa*, should be in the form of a mountain cave (*śailaguhākāra*) and in two floors—*dvibhūmi*. From *śailaguhākāra*

Abhinava concludes that from it follows the firmness of sound—i.e. when the theatre is constructed in the form of a cave, it leads to the firm resonance of sound. Prof. Subbarao says that *śailaguhākāra* means that the centre of the roof is higher than the sides. It simply means that the theatre must have a gabled roof, hipped at the ends. "The accoustical prcperty of a gabled roof is to reflect the sound from the stage to the audience in an auditorium, and that of a flat roof is to reflect the sound back again to the stage."[61]

Abhinava gives several interpretations of *dvibhūmi*. According to some, two floors refer to the different elevations of parts of the stage. Others say that along the measure of the external projection of the *mattavāraṇī*, a second wall is to be constructed like the *pradikṣiṇā-mārga* in temples of the gods. Some others say that a second floor is to be constructed in the theatre. Still others read *advibhūmi* for *dvibhūmi*. Abhinava's teacher, Bhaṭṭatauta, holds that it really refers to the succession of levels in the theatre—low, high and still higher, running from *raṅgapīṭha* to the door for public entrance. This will prevent the obstruction of spectators by each other, produce form of the mountain cave and provide firm resonance.[62]

The theatre is to have few windows with low access of air, almost without flow of breeze and with resonant sound.[63] This would lead to the orchestra having a deep resonance. The walls should be plastered. Abhinava explains that the plaster should consist of ground conchshells, sand and nacker. Then, on the outside, the walls should be whitewashed with lime (*sudhākarma*). When the surface of wall is burnished and even, it should be painted. The pictures should be of men and women, and of creepers.[64]

Shifting to the *Caturasra* or square theatre, while saying that most of the procedures will be similar as in the rectangular one, Bharata describes in addition the positions of the pillars and the construction of the seats. The pillars were installed for several purposes—for giving support to the ceiling (*maṇḍapadhāraṇa*), for decorative purposes and for dividing the theatre into various parts.[65] Ten pillars were to be the main support of the *maṇḍapa*, and were to be placed on the stage block (*raṅgapīṭhopari*). Six other pillars were to be set up in the interval (between the stage and the auditorium?). Beyond them were to be set up another eight pillars. This gives a total of twenty-four pillars—10 on the *raṅgapīṭha*, 6 between the *raṅgapīṭha* and *prekṣaka niveśa* and 8 apparently in the auditorium where the seats were laid.[66] These 24 apparently exclude the original four pillars at the corners named after the different *varṇas* and also the four columns used in the *saḍdāruka* and the eight columns used in the *mattavāraṇīs*.

The total number would thus become 24 plus 16, that is 40. Apart from these, Bharata prescribes that strong pillars, decorated by caryatids may be further used according to the judgement of experts.[67]

The location of the three groups of pillars, consisting of ten, six and eight pillars respectively, was conceived by different commentators in different ways. According to Śaṅkuka, the ten pillars were thus disposed—four on the four corners of the *raṅgapīṭha*; four more, each being four *hastas* distant from these four pillars towards the south and the north, and the remaining two at the same distance from the eastern two of the central pillars further toward the east by four *hastas*. These constitute the first group of pillars. The remaining six include two on the southern and two on the northern side of the pillars on the *raṅgapīṭha* and two by the side of the eastern pillars. The remaining eight are in the auditorium on its eastern-most side.[68]

Another view mentioned by Abhinava agrees with this view in the respect to the ten and six pillars, but eight pillars are on this view placed not at the back of the auditorium, but on the boundary of the *nepathya* and *raṅgaśirṣa*.[69]

The account of Abhinava also mentions the view of a Vārtikakāra. On this view, of the first group of ten pillars, the ninth and tenth are placed to the west rather than the east of the central six pillars which are simiiar to the arrangement of Śaṅkuka. In the next group of six, three are placed to the south and three to the west in such a way that only two are to the east of the *raṅgapīṭha*, the other four are to the west, near the *nepathya*. The remaining eight form a kind of enclosure with two on each side of the central eight pillars.[70]

Abhinava sums up the discussion with reference to the views of his teacher, Bhaṭṭatauta. According to the latter[71] the pillars have been divided into three groups of 10, 6 and 8 because they are located at three levels. The three levels are the lower floor (*adhobhūmi*) where the spectators are seated, *raṅgapīṭha* which is higher and *raṅgaśirṣa* which is higher still. The first group of 10 pillars is located in the *adhodhūmi*, the second group of six pillars is located in the *raṅgapīṭha*, while the third group of eight pillars is located in the *raṅgaśirṣa*. The main difficulty in this interpretation is to justify the location of the ten pillars in the auditorium instead of the *raṅgapīṭha*. Since the text of Bharata clearly speaks of them as *raṅgapīṭhoparisthitāḥ*'. It has been suggested the Bhaṭṭatauta offered two explanations of this. Firstly, he understood '*upari*' to mean 'in front of' or 'beyond'. Secondly, he even took the text to be '*raṅgapīṭham paristhita*' where *pari* had the sense of avoiding.

Turning now to the seating of the spectators, we find Bharata pres-

cribing it in verses 90-92. The seating of the spectators was to have the size of one *hasta* with the height of half *hasta*. Prof. Subbarao has pointed out that *bhūmibhāga* is a technical term for one half. Thus each seat was to be one *hasta* in width and half *hasta* in height and these seats were to be in tiers. The *raṅgapīṭha* was to be clearly visible from the seats. The auditorium was to be constructed out of bricks and timber.

In this context, '*sopāānākṛtipīṭhakam*' of verse 90 has been interpreted as referring to the base of the pillars. It may be suggested that it should be connected with the next verse dealing with the construction of the seats. This is also supported by one of the verses quoted by Abhinava of the Vārtikakāra, which says that the staircase-like base should be constructed all around the *raṅga*.

As for the entrances there was to be an entrance at the back of the *nepathya gṛha* on the western side of the theatre for the actors and another on the eastern side for the spectators.[72] Thus the theatre faced the east, with a gable roof and a gallery running around it giving the impression of a second storey. It had tiered seats in the auditorium, and on the west the stage with numerous, well decorated columns on which rested the beam of the roof.

The architecture of Bharata's theatre reflects traditional and general features of the times. The concept of the theatre being modelled on a mountain cave is highly suggestive because as we know the use of the caves for monastic residence was widespread. Not only does the Buddhist *Vinaya* mention *guhā* as one of the types of monasteries, but from Aśokan times, historical examples of cave monasteries abound. What is more, we even have the example of a cave theatre in the Ramgarh hills. A peculiar advantage of the cave is its resonance. Just as the cave architecture had imitated the use of timber in huts, similarly now, the form of the cave with reference to its ceiling vault and gable end are imitated in the structural theatres. We find theatrical architecture using brick foundations, walls made of well-baked bricks and the technology of roofing big halls. The walls were plastered, white-washed and painted. The pillars had stepped bases, capitals, brackets, and carvings including figures called *śālabhañjikā*. The roofing was apparently of timber. The structure of beams was mainly supported by pillars.

The stage did not use properties except sparingly. *Āhāryābhinaya* has been explained as the preparations in the green room—'*nepathya-vidhiḥ*.[73] They enable different types of mental states and characters to find suitable expression on the stage. "*Āhārya* is to acting as the wall is to paintings done on it."[74] Four kinds of *Āhārya* are

mentioned—a)[75] *pusta* or model work, b) *alaṅkāra* or decoration, c) *aṅgaracanā* or the make-up in accordance with the role, and d) *sajīva* or different objects represented on the stage. Model work or *pusta* was of 3 kinds, following different measures and forms *(nāma-rūpa-pramāṇataḥ)*. The first was *Sandhima*, which included productions made up from joining pieces of bamboo or birch *(kiliñja)* and covering them up with skins or clothes. The second was called *vyājima*. Here some mechanical means *(yantra)* were used for moving the model, such as a string. The third variety was called *veṣṭima*, where a covering by lac or wax was used. In general, mountains, vehicles, *vimānas*, shields, armours, flags etc., were included in *pusta*.[76] Thus, in the *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, the king enters seated on a chariot; in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* a clay toy-cart gives the name to the play. In the *Bālarāmāyaṇa* we have mechanical dolls. Mythical animals and monsters could be made of bamboos and cloth. Weapons were not to be made of hard material. The general princip'e followed was not that of stark realism but of conventional representation. "The kind of production which depends on much use of wooden machines *(kāṣṭhayantrabhūyiṣṭha)* is not to be used in our theatrical productions because it implies a great deal of labour *(khedāvaha)*. Whatever substances of diverse characteristics are found in real life, the imitation of their forms are a means to be used in the theatre. Palaces, houses, vehicles and diverse weapons cannot be reproduced in their characteristics in real life. Realism (*lokadharmī)* is different, theatrical representation *(nāṭyadharmī*) is different. The former is the real nature of things *(svabhāva)*, the latter only an image *(vibhāvanā)*. Theatrical weapons should not be made of iron nor should they be substantial lest they be a burden. Theatrical implements should be light and made of wood, leather, cloth, lac, bamboo pieces etc. Shields, armour, flags, mountains, palaces, houses, horses, elephants, vehicles, temples or flying cars *(vimāna)* etc. after being constructed by bamboo pieces should be covered with coloured cloth and given the shapes of the objects represented. If suitable cloth is not at hand, then palm leaves and birch bark may be used. The weapons may be made of straw, bamboo splits, lac, gourd etc. in diverse shapes. Models *(sārūpyāṇi)* may be created of straw, bark, gourd etc. Diverse shapes resembling the original may be made of clay, gourd, cloth, wax, lac, bits of mica (*abhra)*, *atasi*, *śaṇa*, *bilva* etc.[77]

The preparation of the actors in the green room included the use of elaborate make-up, costumes, jewellery and ornaments. The make-up of actresses included the painting of eyes, lips and teeth as also the painting of the feet. The diverse ornaments have been prescribed

but it is laid down that they should not impose too much weight. Hair style and costumes were to be distinctive of the character represented. Thus, *muni-kanyās* were to have a costume suitable for their dwelling in forests, the *gandharva*-women were to have sapphires to decorate them, white teeth and black clothes.[78] When representing women separated from their husbands, their dress was to be dusty and their hair bound up in a single plait.[79] Actors had to have their limbs and complexion painted in diverse colours to suit the types of characters they were required to represent. This enabled them to represent gods, demons, *gandharvas* etc.[80] Thus gods, *yakṣas* and *apsarās* were to be fair; Rudra, Sun, Brahmā and Skanda were to have the shine of gold etc. Kings were to have a lotus-complexion, fair or dark. Happy mortals were to be represented as fair, the sick or the evil-doers were to be represented as black; *Kirāta*, *Barbara*, *Āndhra*, *Draviḍa*, the people of *Kāśī* and *Kosala*, *Pulindas* and the Southerners were to be generally represented as swarthy.[81] On the other hand, *Śakas*, *Yavanas*, *Pahlavas*, *Bāhlīkas* and other Northerners were to be generally represented as fair. Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas were to be fair, Vaiśyas and Śūdras dark. The colours of the costumes too, varied according to the conventions of representation. Thus Buddhist and other monks were to be dressed in ochre coloured robes, the Pāśupatas were to have variegated robes.[82] Warriors were to be shown in martial attire with armour, bow and quiver. Kings were to have crowns of which three varieties have been mentioned. Ministers and merchants were represented as wearing turbans. Many types of religieux had shaven heads; crooks and rakes kept curly hair.[83]

Sajīva meant the forms of living beings such as snakes, birds, animals and men.[84] These were to be represented in scenes of fighting, siege etc. Thus, when the use of *nāgāstra* or snake weapon was shown, the forms of snakes were to be represented.[85]

The term '*naṭa*' is held to have denoted a variety of allied professions viz., dancer, pantomime, acrobat, juggler and actor, and the precise history of these meanings and the social history of the professions is not clear. As mentioned before, the evidence of Pāṇini, Baudhāyana, Kauṭilya and Patañjali clearly indicates that the '*naṭas*' were professional actors with their own tradition, customary laws *(āmnāya* or *dharma)*[86] and teachers *(nāṭyācāryas)* who gave instructions in a variety of skills. They were organized in troupes under a leader often styled *Sūtradhāra*. These wandering troupes were sometimes treated as sub-castes and despised, especially for their low morals.[87] However, they also laid claim to professional excellence and

respect from connoisseurs and popularity from spectators.[88] Even sages and royal personages participated in stage-acting and the art had a divine prototype.[89] Learned authors had actors as their companions.[90] It must, thus, be concluded that the actors belonged to several social strata—the lowly, wandering in villages, as well as the more affluent and accomplished who enjoyed the patronage and even company of learned poets and royal courts. They not only performed as instructed but also shared in the aesthetics of the enterprize.

The actors included men as well as women.[91] Although sometimes men also played female parts and were then known as *bhrūkuṁsa*,[92] it was quite usual for actresses to play such roles. The use of the *kaiśikī vṛtti*, in particular, made the employment of actresses imperative.[93] Again, they were indispensable for singing. Literary descriptions of play-acting clearly indicate the prevalence of actresses for the rendering of female roles.[94] Occasionally actresses also played the role of men. The playing of roles, is in fact, divided into three types[95] viz., *anurūpa*, *bṛhadrūpa (virūpa)* and *avirūpānurūpiṇi (rūpānurūpa)*. Where actresses take on female role and men male roles that is known as *anurūpaprakṛti*. Where the roles are adopted without regard to the age of the actor in relation to that of the character, it is known as *virūpa*. Where the actors and actresses play the parts of characters of the opposite sex we have the third type.

High qualifications have been laid down for the *Sūtradhāra* or the *Nāṭyācārya* who was the Director of the play and himself the principal actor.[96] He was expected to be not only learned and skilled but full of moral qualities. He alone was authorized to perform the ritual of worshipping the gods. Since the play began with such worship, he introduced it and often took the leading role. He was assisted by his wife who used to be an actress or a *naṭī*. He was also assisted by other male actors in the Prologue called *Sthāpaka* or *Pāripārśvika*.[97] High qualifications have been mentioned for the actresses. They were required to be accomplished in various arts including music, dance and acting.

About acting itself, it has to be remembered that it was a combination of realistic representation and conventional gestures and symbolism called *lokadharmī* and *nāṭyadharmī*[98] respectively. The conventional element was the most prominent in the representation of character-types and their identification as also in the ways in which invisible elements and actions were indicated. Realism, on the other hand, was prominent in the acting of emotions through gestures. So detailed and thorough was the training in such acting that the whole body was used as a tool of precision for the suggestion of a wide gamut of

feelings.

The audience included the high and the low, the four castes, women and children, princes, ministers, priests and the numerous retinue of the court. The kings and the retinue enjoyed a place of honour and the seating of the socially high-ups followed a detailed precedence. The audience also included experts who acted as judges *(Prāśnikas)* of the theatrical production.[99] The well-developed principles of the theatrical representation and dramaturgy in the *NŚ* obviously reflect the result of a long tradition of critical analysis and judgement of dramatic production and performance.

Footnotes

1 *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, (SBE), V, p. 413.
2 *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, IV, 3, 110.
3 *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtras*, 2. 2. 5.
4 *Arthaśāstra*, 2. 27. 25.
5 *Mahābhāṣya* ad *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, 3. 1. 26.
6 Bloch, *ASI Report*, 1903-04, pp. 123 ff.
7 See supra, Chap. I.
8 Keith, *Sanskrit Drama*, p. 358.
9 *Ibid*. pp. 57 ff. Weber had raised the probability of Greek influence through the courts of Bactrian kings in India but Pischel criticised him. Windisch raised the probability afresh by emphasizing the sea-change which must occur to transform mere dance and pantomime or epic recitation into the kind of regular drama presupposed by the *NŚ*. The example of Gandhāra art and the spirit of enlightened rulers like Menander suggest the possibility of Greek influence in the spheres. Although little evidence of the influence of Greek on Indian philosophy is attestable, the influence on astronomy is undoubted. Some contact between Greek and Sanskrit drama, thus, would not be impossible but the detailed comparison of the two do not bring to light any decisive resemblances. On the other hand, the difference of spirit and atmosphere is quite striking. *Yavanikā* or *Javanikā* is without significance since Greek drama used no curtain and the presence of *Yavanīs* only reflect a feature of Indian courts. Although both Indian and Greek drama were conceived as 'imitation', Indian drama emphasized the reprentation of mental states *(bhāva)* rather than mere action. It analysed action quite differently and often used a much larger span of time and a much larger number of characters. Its treatment of *bhāvas* has a much larger range. The old Greek drama, in contrast, left romance alone, while the New

Attic Comedy resembles to some extent the *Nāṭikā* and to some extent the *Prakaraṇa* rather than the *Nāṭaka*. Noticeable are the similarities in themes of 'complications', and 'unravelling' of romances, though 'recognition' etc. do not really indicate any specific borrowing. On the characters, *Viṭa*, *Vidūṣaka* and *Śakāra*, which have been cited as showing Greek influence, the verdict must be 'unproven'.

10 As Keith states, the views of Sylvain Lévi and Sten Konow rest on the assumption that drama originated as a religious drama in Prākṛta, and the Śakas patronised Sanskrit for secular purposes and helped the creation of Sanskrit drama. (*op. cit.*, p. 71). Mathurā and Ujjain are held to have been the centres in the first and third centuries A. D. The clear connection of Sanskrit with the Śakas, however, emerges only with Rudradāman who claims to be educated in a pre-existing literary and artistic tradition rather than to be the creator of one. Vide his Junagadh inscription.

11 *NŚ*, 2, 8.

12 *Ibid.*, *l.c.* Cf. Abhinaya on this—*Etānvye a trīṇi jyeṣṭhādīnīti kecit. Anye tu pratyekaṁ tritvam iti navaite'tra bhedā ityāhuḥ. Etad eva yuktam.*

13 *dvibhūmir nāṭyamaṇḍapaḥ*—*NŚ*, 2, 80.

14 *Ibid.*, 2, 35.

15-16 *Ibid.*, 2, 33-35.

17 See, *infra*.

18 Cf. G.K. Bhatt, *Theatric Aspects of Sanskrit Drama*, pp. 67-70.

19 *NŚ*, 2, 96-97 and *AB* on these—*tena dvāradvyam eva raṅgaśirasi nepathyagatapātrapraveśāva kartavyam.* It quotes *NŚ*, 13, 2, "*Ye nepathyagṛhadvāre mayā pūrvam prakīrtite.*

20 *Tayor bhāṇḍasya vinyāsaḥ*—*ibid.*, 13.2.

21 *Ibid.*, 2, 63, 67, 69.

22 See, *infra*.

23 *NŚ*, 2, 91-92.

24 *Ibid.*, 2, 92-96.

25 *kāryaḥ śailaguhākāraḥ*—*NŚ*, 2, 80.

26 *Ibid.*, 2, 86-97.

27 *Ibid.*, 2, 78, 84-85.

28 Cf. Subbarao, *NŚ*, Vol. I, p. 454.

29 D.R. Mankad, 'Ancient Indian Theatre,' *IHQ*, 1932; Subbarao, *NŚ*, Vol. I, App.; Visvesvara Shastri, *Abhinavabhāratī*; M.M. Ghosh, *IHQ*, 1933; Raghavan, *IHQ*, 1933.

30 *AB* on *NŚ*, 2, 7-9.

31 *Ibid.*, *l.c.*

32 *Ibid.*, on *NŚ*, 2, 10-11.
33 *Ibid.*, on *NŚ*, 2, 7-9.
34 *NŚ*, Vol. I, p. 427.
35 *Ibid.*, p. 428.
36 *IHQ*, 1932.
37 *Abhinavabhāratī*, edited and translated by Visvesvara Shastri, pp. 254-61.
38 *Ibid.*, p. 288.
39 *AB*, Vol. I, p. 210.
40 *NŚ*, Vol. I, pp. 440-43.
41 Keith, *Sanskrit Drama*, p. 359.
42 *AB* on *NŚ*, 2, 33-34.
43 *AB* on *NŚ*, 2, 64.
44 *NŚ*, Vol. I, p. 446.
45 Quoted by Keith, *op. cit.*, p. 360.
46 *AB* on *NŚ*, Vol. I, p. 62.
47 *Ibid.*, *l.c.* Cf. Visvesvara Shastri, *op. cit.*, pp. 324-27 and the diagrams on p. 326.
48 *NŚ*, Vol. I, p. 444.
49 *Ibid.*, p. 61.
50 Visvesvara Shastri, *op. cit.*, p. 314.
51 *NŚ*, Vol. I, pp. 441-43.
52 Quoted V. Shastri, *op. cit.*, p. 317.
53 *Vāsavadattā* by Subandhu, quoted V. Shastri, *op. cit.*, p. 313.
54 *NŚ*, 2, 36-37.
55 *Ibid.*, 2, 48-49.
56 *Ibid.*, 2, 61-62.
57 *Ibid.*, 2, 75-78.
58 Vide U.N. Roy, *Śālabhañjikā*, 1979.
59 *AB*, *NŚ*, Vol. I, pp. 62-63; V. Shastri, *op. cit.*, pp. 331-32.
60 Subbarao, *NŚ*, Vol. I, p. 447.
61 *Ibid.*, *l.c.*
62 *NŚ*, Vol. I, pp. 61-62.
63 *NŚ*, 2, 81.
64 *Ibid.*, 2, 82-85.
65 *Ibid.*, 2, 90.
66 *Ibid.*, 2, 89-93.
67 *Ibid.*, 2, 95.
68 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 66; V. Shastri, *op. cit.*, p. 348.
69 *Ibid.*, *l.c.*
70 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 67.
71 For an interpretation of this part of *AB* see V. Shastri, *op. cit.*,

pp. 362 ff.
72 Cf. V. Shastri, *op. cit.*, pp. 383-84.
73. *NŚ*, 21, 3.
74 *Ibid.*, 21, 5 (Kāvyamālā ed.)
75 *Abhinavabhāratī*, Vol. III, p. 109.
76 *Śailayānavimānāni carma-varma-dhvajānagāḥ*—*NŚ*, 21, 9.
77 *Ibid.*, 21.205.
78 *Ibid.*, 21.61.
79 *Ibid.*, 21.75.
80 *Ibid.*, 21.77.
81 *Ibid.*, 21.110.11.
82 *Ibid.*, 21.130-32.
83 *Ibid.*, 21.119-20.
84 *Ibid.*, 21.162.
85 *AB* on *NŚ*, 21.164.
86 Cf. *Kāśikā* ad *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, 4, 3, 129.
87 Cf. *Mahābhāṣya* ad *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, 2, 3, 67.
88 Eg. instances quoted by Keith, *Sanskrit Drama*, pp. 362-63.
89 Cf. *NŚ*, I.
90 Cf. *Harṣacarita*, Bombay, 1937, pp. 41-42.
91 *NŚ*, 26, 9-10.
92 Cf. *Mahābhāṣya* ad *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, 4, 13.
93 *NŚ*, I.
94 Cf. *Kuṭṭanīmatam*, vv. 856 ff.
95 *NŚ*, 26.1.
96 *NŚ*, 26.35-36.
97 *Ibid.*, 24
98 Vide, infra, Chap. III.
99 *NŚ*, 27, 50-53, 64-67.

Chapter 3

Theory and Practice of Drama

Nāṭya has been derived from the root *naṭ* in the sense of movement *(avaspandana)* and has been distinguished from *Nṛtya* and *Nṛtta*, both derived from the root *nṛt* in the sense of throwing about one's limbs *(gātra-vikṣepa)*.[1] *Nṛtta* is the simplest of the three, and simply denotes the movements of limbs in a definite rhythm and tempo—"*Nṛttam tālalayāśrayam*".[2] *Nṛtya* involves acting *(abhinaya)* in a limited sense. *Abhinaya* had the sense of bringing forth or presentation—"*Abhipūrvastu nīñdhaturabhimukhyarthanirṇaye/Yasmāt prayogam nayati tasmād abhinayaḥ smṛtaḥ.*"[3] *Abhinaya* was of four recognised types, *Sāttvika*, *Vācika*, *Āṅgika* and *Āhārya.* Of these, *nṛtya* had a profusion of *Āṅgika.* The dancer expressed emotional states through the motion and disposition of his limbs. Hence, *nṛtya* has been described as *bhāvāśraya*, i. e. based on *bhāva* or feeling. Alternatively, it has been described as *padārthābhinaya*, or the representation of the meaning of a word, i.e. a self-contained and static tableau. In contrast *nāṭya* is the enacting of a sequence of such meanings which are linked as a sentence *(Vākyārthābhinaya)*.[4] *Nṛtya* is a mere spectacle which is the representation of some object. *Nāṭya* is the articulate expression of connected meanings communicating *rasa.* Thus, unlike *nṛtya*, *nāṭya* uses not merely the language of bodily gestures and movements but primarily the language of articulate speech. It is not so much a spectacle as a communication.

This may be seen most clearly by recalling the connection of *nāṭya* with the *vṛttis* i.e. modes or styles of behaviour and representation—"*Vyāpāraḥ punarartha-sādhaka vṛttiḥ.*" *Vṛtti* is the manner of action adopted to pursue human values. Such actions are mental, vocal and physical *(Vāgaṅgasattvaceṣṭāsāmanyam)*.[5] *Sāttvatī*, *Bhāratī* and *Ārabhaṭī* are connected with three ways of actions respectively. Apart from these three is the additional dimension of grace in actions. That which is conducive to grace and belongs so distinctively to women, the peculiarly 'aesthetic' component of behaviour, is termed *kaiśikī.*[6] Now these four dimensions of behaviour—linguistic articulation and communication, psychic high-mindedness or heroism,

impetuousity and violence, aesthetic grace—constitute the matrix of *nāṭya*—"*Vṛttayo nāṭyamātaraḥ*."[7] Of these while three belong to the object matter of *nāṭya*, *Bhāratī* belongs to its principal expressive medium which is the language or speech. The ubiquity of *Bhāratī* makes *nāṭya* primarily a spoken communication—"*Vāci yatnastu kartavyo nāṭyasvaiṣā tanūḥ smṛtā/Āṅga-nepathya-sattvāni vākyārtham vyañjayanti hi//*"[8] Although Abhinavagupta has given a neat, logical explanation of *vṛttis* as different kinds of dimensions of behaviour, the original conception as reflected in the *NŚ* is more practical. It seems to have been a classification of principal elements or aspects or dramatic representation to which the dramatist and producer must pay attention and it was obviously connected with the classification of *abhinaya*. The connection of *Sātvatī*, *Bhāratī*, and *Ārabhaṭī*, *Vācika* and *Āṅgika* is clear enough. By exclusion it follows that *Kaiśikī* would be connected with *āhāryābhinaya*. The role of make-up in lending grace to the dramatic performance is specially connected with the playing of female roles. If, as is likely, female roles were, in an earlier stage of the evolution of the theatre, either excluded or played by male actors, this would be even more intelligible.[9] As a whole, the *vṛttis* indicate that drama rests on four principal pillars—speech, character, action and artistry.

The origin of drama is traced to the creator Brahmā himself.[10] When the *Kṛtayuga* had passed and the *Tretā* had fully commenced, the purity of the human mind and conduct declined.[11] Passions of diverse kinds—sex, greed, envy, anger etc., assailed mankind which now experienced the vicissitudes of pleasure and pain.[12] The influence of diverse gods and demons, gandharvas and yakṣas, rakṣāsas and nāgas spread over the Jambūdvīpa.[13] In this situation the gods led by Indra approached Brahmā and entreated him to provide them with a means of entertainment which would be perceptible by eyes and ears.[14] As the *Vedas* were not to be recited to the Śūdras, a different and fifth *Veda* was required which would be available to all the *varṇas*.[15] As Brahmā recalled the four *Vedas* through the power of concentration and created *Nāṭyaveda* out of the elements drawn from the four *Vedas*, he took *pāṭhya* or dialogue from *Ṛgveda*, music from *Sāmaveda*, acting (*abhinaya*) from *Yajurveda*, and the *rasas* from *Atharvaveda*. The *Nāṭyaveda*, thus created, was connected with the *Vedas* as well as the *Upaniṣads*.[16] Brahmā then instructed the lord of the gods to put the science of drama into action but the gods confessed their inability to do so and the task thus devolved on the sage Bharata who instructed his hundred sons in the art and staged a play based on the three *vṛttis*—*Bhāratī*, *Sātvatī* and *Ārabhaṭī*.[17] At this

Brahmā asked him to include the *Kaiśikī vṛtti* also. Bharata received verbal instructions from Brahmā but saw the spectacle of *Kaiśikī* in the dancing Śiva and realized that with its delicacy and romantic origin it could not be produced without the help of female roles. Thus the apsarās were created by the will of Brahmā and with them were employed the sage Svāti, the creator of the orchestra, and the gandharvas with the sage Nārada at their head.[18] Dancers and musicians, thus, helped to add the *Kaiśikī vṛtti* to *nāṭya*. With these preparations, the first play was staged on the occasion of the flag festival *(dhvajamaha)* of Mahendra.[19] After the ceremonial *Nāndī*, the drama represented the struggle of gods and demons and the victory of the former. It is said that the form of the drama was a *Ḍima* or a *Samavakāra* or an *Īhāmṛga*.[20] Presumably it was the celebrated *Ḍima Tripuradāha* or the *Samavakāra Amṛtamanthana*.[21] The demons, however, were greatly incensed by the performance and proceeded to obstruct and undo the performance. As a means of protection against such obstructions Brahmā recommended the creation of a theatrical hall (*nāṭyagṛha*).[22] He then proceeded to mollify the demons by saying that the drama was intended to illustrate only the moral law, not to represent the deeds of the gods or demons as such. It was really the exemplification of the inner reality of the whole of life, its ideal being or pattern (*bhāvānukīrtanam*).[23]

This classic account of the origin of the *nāṭya* given by Bharata is itself mythical in nature, but in the manner of myths it gives expression to a number of traditional beliefs about the sources, nature and purpose of *nāṭya*. By attributing the origin of *nāṭya* to the Creator himself, it emphasises the natural and primaeval character of the human instinct of communicating and entertaining by dramatizing. It also brings out the role of creativity in the dramatist. The parallel between the Creator of the universe and the poet is a well-known one.[24] This view, thus, traces the root of drama in the imaginative creativity latent in human nature itself. It is in contrast to the historical view of Aristotle who traces the origin of Greek tragedy to the dithyrambic chorus of satyrs and of comedy to the phallic song and dance. The inventiveness of Aeschylus and Sophocles in introducing the second and third actors led to the growth of tragedy.[25] The earliest Indian drama, on the other hand, had the character of representing a myth celebrating the conflict of gods and demons *(devāsura-saṅgrāma)*. As a consequence, it had a large number of characters from the start.

Again, this account while making *nāṭya* the natural outcome of the creative instinct as personified in the god of creation, also makes

it clear that this search for recreation through the imaginative re-creation of experience belongs not to the original golden age of human society but to a later and a more familiar age when men were less perfect. Human imperfection and the resultant vicissitudes of pleasure and pain, thus, are the source material which creativity fashions as an imaginative spectacle.[26] This representation, however, is not a mere imitation of life but an illustration of the working of the moral idea operative in human nature in and through the inter-connections of actions and passions.[27] Drama presupposes the role of passions and actions in human life, but it also presupposes the working of the moral law in shaping human destiny.

The connection of dramatic performances with the popular festivals of the gods, especially the festival of Indra's Flag, also comes out in this account. It may be recalled that Indra was the chief Vedic god of war and victory, the hero of the most celebrated mythical struggle between the gods and demons.[28] This myth was really the myth of creation, of how the chaotic formlessness of darkness is overcome by the cosmos-revealing plasticity of light. It also symbolises the victory of good over evil. The connection of light and water in Vedic imagination and language helped the transformation of Indra into a rain god and the myth came to have a special meaning in the context of the fertilization of the soil by the monsoon rains. The abduction of the life-giving waters by the Demon and their recovery by the storming of his stronghold by the divine hero supplied a perennial motif for representation. The seriousness and magic of ritual, the joy and popularity of the festival and the creative vision of the artist seeking to reconstruct the ideal meaning of life out of the recurrent fragments and patterns of experience, all combined into the spectacle of theatrical performance.

Although mythical and philosophical rather than historical, this account of Bharata's *NŚ* indicates two developmental features. In the first place it tells us that the drama originally lacked female actors and the element of female grace, dance and music. These elements constituting the *Kaiśikī vṛtti* are supposed to have been added later. Similarly, we gather that originally the performance of drama was in an open-air stage. The use of a theatrical building was resorted to later to avoid unwarranted obstruction and interference.[29]

We may, thus, conclude that the origin of drama was attributed to divine inspiration, but human agency. It was the creation of Brahmā in its ideality but was produced by the seers belonging to the human world. Myths constituted its original thematic material, *devāsurasaṅgrāma* being the primary myth. The production of dramatic

plays was closely connected with the Flag Festival of Indra, the great Vedic god. Female actors, dance and music were gradually added to the features of drama as was a characteristic kind of theatrical architecture. Apart from Brahmā and Indra, Rudra and Viṣṇu also came to be specially connected with the tradition of drama.

About the nature of *nāṭya*, it has been stated that Bharata regarded it as imitation and this has naturally invited comparison with Aristotle.[30] It has further been said that the object of imitation in Indian drama was the emotional states of the mind while in Greek drama it was action and this would explain the relatively static, poetic and sentimental character of Indian drama as compared to Greek drama. On the other hand, Abhinavagupta is emphatic that the concept of imitation is altogether inapplicable to drama and that Bharata never intended it.[31] For Bharata, the suggestive intimation of *rasa* is the common essence of drama and poetry, a theory which received wide acceptance in later times. Since Bharata was the original propounder of *rasa*, it does seem necessary to reconcile the concepts of *rasa* and *anukṛti*.

If we turn to the evidence we find that the *NŚ* clearly uses the term *anukṛti* or *imitation* for drama at several places. Thus "*tadante' nukṛtir baddhā yathā daityāḥ surair jitāḥ*" (1, 57). At the end of the *Nāndī* the imitation was produced in which it was shown how the demons were vanquished by the gods. "*Lokavṛttānukaraṇam nāṭyam etan mayākṛtam*" (1,112)—I have created this *nāṭya* as the imitaion of social life (or the 'happenings of the world'); "*Sapta-dvīpānukaraṇam nāṭyam etad bhaviṣyati*" (1, 117)—this *nāṭya* will be the imitation of the seven continents; "*yenānukaraṇam nāṭyam etad tad yan mayā kṛtam*" (bracketed text in the GOS ed.). In the *Kāvyamālā* ed, this line is included in 1, 117 but the previous line *Saptadvīpa* etc. is bracketed. However, Abhinava comments on *Saptadvīpānukaraṇam* etc. but omits mentioning *yenānukaraṇam* etc.—"It is imitation that I have created as *nāṭya*."

These references certainly make it clear that *nāṭya* was regarded by Bharata as imitation in some sense. The speech, gestures, manners, appearance and dress of actors did seek to conform to what was current in society. This conformity to social reality is what Abhinavagupta understands *lokavṛttānukaraṇam* to mean. It is not the reference to any specific actuality. When a person uses language in accordance with the current social idiom, he cannot be said to be imitating anyone. His conformity to social usage is merely a precondition of social communication. It is the same with the stage. Rules and conventions accepted in society are followed on the stage also so that the play-

wright and the producer may be able to communicate with the audience. The drama is a set of visible and audible presentations which communicate a meaning (*vākyārtha*) which is ultimately nothing but *rasa*. Each presentation in the drama, thus, functions as a part of a composition (*saṁyoga*) which evokes an inner experience (*anuvyavasāya*) culminating in *rasa*. That is why Bharata describes nāṭya as *bhāvānukīrtanam* and this Abhinava regards as its real characterization. That drama does not intend simply to represent or imitate the ways of gods or demons comes out clearly in the line "*Naikāntato'tra bhavatām devānāṁ cānubhāvanam*" (1, 107).

The theory of *nāṭya* as imitation must not in any case be confused with any kind of naturalism. Gods and demons, myths and miracles formed unquestioned parts of the ancient dramatic world. It was further clearly realized that dramatic representation was a mixture of conventionalism and realism.[32] The purpose of 'imitating' reality was only to remove hindrances in the suspension of disbelief.

An Abhinavagupta points out, the spectacle of imitation produces a sense of ridicule. Besides, it assumes a pre-existing reality or model which has to be represented. It commits the same fallacy which those theories of language commit which identify 'meanings' with natural objects. Such theories miss the constructive and creative aspect of language or drama. What drama does is not to evoke one's memory of some natural object, but to reveal an inner meaning 'recollected in tranquility'. The concept of revelation is more relevant here than that of imitation.

The purpose of drama needs to be analysed in this context. Imitation or the naturalistic representation of some reality is in itself relevant only for giving information and such a spectacle would correspond to a mere factual description or narrative. Just as poetry is no history, drama cannot be a mere visual documentary.[33] Doubtless, *nāṭya* has been called the fifth *Veda* and it is *Nāṭyaveda* which was created by Brahmā. Nevertheless, such an appellation was metaphorical rather than literal because the *Vedas* were prescriptive with mandatory force, the *nāṭya* did not have such a character. Nevertheless the two agreed in not being merely descriptive and in seeking to draw their audience to a truth which is not normally realized in every-day life. Drama, thus, is a source of wisdom, which throws light on the vicissitudes of life. As the same time it is the source of perennial delight and amusement. It instructs as well as entertains "*Hitopadeśajananam dhṛtikrīḍāsukhādikṛt*" (1,113). As later theorists explained, the instruction was not in the peremptory manner of the *Vedas*, but in the manner of a dear friend's suggestion.[34] Its

principal theme was the working of the moral law through the vicissitudes of experience: "*.........śubhāśubhavikalpakaḥ karmabhāvānyayāpekṣī nāṭya-vedo mayā kṛtaḥ* (1, 106). But it does not portray only the serious side of life, it portrays the lighter and amusing side equally "*Kvacid dharmaḥ kvacid krīḍā kavcid arthaḥ kvaccicchamaḥ, Kavcid hāsyam kvacid yuddham kvacid kāmaḥ kvacid vadhaḥ*" (1, 108). Human activity in all its wide variety formed its subject matter. The pursuit of *dharma*, *artha* and *kāma* were all part of its world. "*Dharmo dharmapravṛttānāṁ kāmaḥ kāmopasevinām, nigraho durvinītānāmvinītānāṁ dama-kriyā* (1, 109). Heroism and cowardice, folly and wisdom, pomp of power, fortitude in suffering, quest of gain, patience in affliction, all manner of mental states and changing fortunes are represented in drama—"*Nānābhāvopasampannaṁ nānāvasthāntrātmakam*" (1, 112). Its appeal lay to all classes of society, high, low and middling and to the diverse castes. It was intended to give strength to thesuffering, relaxation to the weary and contribute to righteousness and social good—"*Dharmyaṁ yaśasyam āyuṣyam hitaṁ buddhivivardhanam/Lokopadeśajananam nāṭyam etadbhaviṣyati//* In short, the scope of *nāṭya* is universal and encyclopaedic, it represents all sides of human life and thought—*Na tajjñānam na tacchilpaṁ na sā vidyā na sā kalā/Nasau yogo na tat karma nāṭye' smin yan na dṛśyate* (1,116). Drama, thus, is not merely a colourful spectacle accompanied by dance and music but a suggestive and meaningful statement which seeks to touch the heart and fortify the moral sense. While allowing full freedom to creative imagination and fancy it conforms to the socially accepted picture of reality—"*Tasmāllokapramāṇam hi kartvyaṁ nāṭyavoktṛbhiḥ*" (varient reading after 1,112, in the GOS ed). The intention was neither to create a naturalistic documentary nor to create a pure fantasia. The intention was to instil a moving insight into human nature and destiny in their diverse aspects, heroic or romantic, tragic or comic, amusing or humorous.[35]

Later theorists have analysed drama into three principal elements viz. *vastu* or plot, *netā* or hero and *rasa* or mood.[35a] If we add *vṛtti* and *abhinaya*, dance and music, *lakṣaṇa* and *alaṁkāra* to these we get the principal elements of drama as they figure in the *NŚ*. These are comparable with the six essential parts of tragedy as stated by Aristotle, viz., plot, character, diction, ideas, lyrical or musical element provided by the chorus, and spectacle.[36] *Abhinaya* especially *āhārya* provided the spectacle. The lyrical or musical element is regarded as essential by Bharata and was provided both as a background as well as constituent. The orchestra or *kutapa* as a prominent feature of the stage, dance and music figure in the *pūrvaraṅga* as

well as during the main play. *Gīta, vādya* and *nāṭya* were to be used in quick succession as in the movement of an *alātacakra*. Nearly seven chapters of the *NŚ* are devoted to music, four specifically to dance and expressive acting involved in it, two to metrics and one to the production of scenic effects. Diction is clearly connected with *vṛttis, alaṁkāra* and *kāku*. Character-types are analysed as *prakṛtis* and the plot or structure is called *itivṛtta* under *sandhyaṅgas* by Bharata. The place of *catharsis* is taken by *rasa*.

Aristotle described plot as the most important element of drama. Drama is the *mimesis* of action and plot its structure.[37] Aristotle wanted the plot to be a compact unity with definite and clear stages, a beginning, a middle and an end. He emphasized the virtue of surprise situations particularly of 'reversal' and 'recognition'. It is well-known that in western drama generally there is a significant difference between tragic and comic plots in as much as the 'complications' are 'resolved' in the latter while there is an inexorable tendency from the crisis towards to a 'catastrophy' in the former. In the *NŚ*, while the importance of unity, logical compactness, clearly phased development, and surprises is admitted and emphasized, the general development of the plot does not admit the characteristic tragic sequence, but rather follows the pattern of comedy in as much as the crisis in the *garbha* and *vimarśa sandhis*, however serious, tends to be resolved in the end. This, however, does not mean that the *NŚ* has no conception of tragedy and has only comic plays in mind because the mood and character of the play as a whole does not simply depend on the formal structure of the play or the death of the hero but rather on the seriousness of the theme, manner and emotions involved.[38]

In contrast to the Aristotelian conception, Bharata regards plot or *itivṛtta* as the body rather than the soul of drama, as is made clear by Abhinavagupta.[39] *Itivṛtta* literally means an account of heppenings, that is to say, the 'story' of events. However, this story is not a mere history or narrative but an artistically subdivided structure and is consequently to be regarded as corresponding to 'plot' rather than mere 'story'. Bharata prescribes a division of the *itivṛtta* into five joints or *sandhis*. He also classifies it into two types viz., principal or *ādhikārika* and subsidiary or *prāsaṅgika*.[40] The principal story is the one in which the primary objective of action represented is attained. The remaining action sequence is to be held subsidiary. The principal action sequence is the cause of the primary attainment while the subsidiary one helps in the process.[41] The distinction between the principal and subsidiary ultimately depends on the discretion of the poet subject to the cogency of the connection imagined

between the characters and the means they employ.[42] That is to say different types of characters must act and aim at objects in conformity with their natures although the poet is free to decide whom to treat as more important than others.[43]

As in Aristotle, so in Bharata the sequence of events plotted are sought to be governed by their proper causal connections. It is the sequence governed by causal operations which gives rise to five stages (*avasthās*) "...... ...*Vyāpāraḥ kāraṇasya yaḥ/Tasyānupūrvyā vijñeyāḥ pañcāvasthāḥ prayoktṛbhiḥ//*" (19,7). These five stages are *Prārambha*, *Prayatna*, *Prāptisambhava*, *Niyataphalaprāpti* and *Phalayoga*. The first is the keenness of the heart to secure an important objective and is like the sowing of a seed. The second is the making of efforts for the realization of the object even when there are no signs of its attainment. In the third stage the discovery of a means and a fleeting glimpse of future success serve to establish the feasibility of attaining the object. In the fourth stage, the means already secured ensure the definiteness of success. In the fifth stage the whole enterprize reaches final success.[44]

Corresponding to these five stages there are five *sandhis* or junctures viz., *mukha*, *pratimuka*, *garbha*, *vimarśa* and *nirvahaṇa*.[45] *Mukha sandhi* is characterized by the 'birth of the seed' (*bījasamutpatti*), that is by the activation of the desire in the hero to gain the primary objective. The introduction of the material relevant to the enterprize falls within this *sandhi* which may roughly be described as the 'beginning' in Aristotelian terms. Bharata describes the 'birth of the seed' as '*nānārtharasasambhava*'. This describes not merely its picturesque diversity, as Abhinava explains, but also that the 'seed' foreshadows the dominant mood and other moods associated with it. *Pratimukha sandhi* shows the clear emegence of the seed. In the earlier *sandhi*, the seed is sown and in the process disappears from view and functions in a subterranean manner. Now it becomes visible overground. In the *garbha sandhi*, the seed sprouts up and blooms. The objective, while it appears to be within grasp yet recedes and produces further search. This corresponds to the stage of *prāptisambhava*. In the *vimarśa sandhi*, there are unexpected doubts or hindrances which delay the conclusion.[46] Whereas in *garbha sandhi* the predominance is of non-attainment, here the predominance is of attainment which is still incomplete. Abhinava says that some read *avamarśa* in place of *vimarśa*. *Vimarśa* has the sense of doubt and corresponds to the hypothetical reasoning called *tarka*. *Avamarśa* has been interpreted as obstruction. If *vimarśa* is favoured it would mean that some unexpected circumstance spurs the hero to renewed effort

This view of *avasthās* and *sandhis* as found in the *NŚ* and followed by all subsequent authors may be said to reflect the basic philosophy of life underlying ancient Indian drama. It is the moral philosophy of the law of *karman* which asserts that ultimately men get their deserts. It is an idealistic and optimistic outlook of life which prompts men to face tribulations and suffering in a confident and hopeful manner, persisting in righteousness and facing adversity as essentially transient. It is this philosophy which makes Sanskrit drama follow the rule of poetic justice. From a modern or rather rationalist point of view, one may call it sentimental or unrealistic and one used to harsh tragedies may find it insipid. However, the fact remains that good Sanskrit drama is neither sentimental nor unrealistic. It faces the uncertainties and vicissitudes of life quite firmly and portrays suffering, violence, errors and accidents realistically. That the play should end in a happy surprise is nothing more than a convention which reflects an accommodation of the popular as well as the philosophical expectation of the law of poetic justice. It does not turn all Sanskrit drama into comedies in the accepted western sense.

Although, generally, the five *sandhis* are to be observed, it is not treated as an invariable rule. Some dramatic types like *Ḍima* and *Samavakāra* have only four *sandhis* excluding the *vimarśa sandhi*. In *vyāyoga* and *īhāmṛga*, two *sandhis*, *garbha* and *vimarśa* are left out. In *Prahasana*, *Vīthī*, *Aṅka* and *Bhāṇa*, *pratimukha*, *garbha* and *vimarśa sandhis* are left out. Thus the beginning and the end, *mukha* and *nirvahaṇa* are universally necessary, but the middle may be attenuated to a vanishing point in a quick and continuous development. In such a syncopated development there is little scope for reversal. This happens in a pure comic play like *Prahasana* or a pure tragic play like *Aṅka* in which there is a quick unilinear movement.[47] Abhinava points out that this suits the behaviour of characters who do not have sufficient depth and moral stature.[48]

Another list of five factors given by Bharata consists of the *Arthaprakṛtis*. These are *Bīja*, *Bindu*, *Prakarī*, *Patākā* and *Kārya*.[49] *Bīja* is small in itself but becomes manifold by development and concludes in the *phala*. *Bindu* serves to give continuity to the diverse, and *Bīja* to the changing pursuits of the hero. Both *Bīja* and *Bindu* continue till the end but while *Bīja* comes at the beginning, *Bindu* comes later. It enables the dramatist to maintain the inner link in changing situations. *Patākā* is a subsidiary sequence which helps the main story while directly serving another. It has also been described simply as the story of the second hero *(upanāyakacaritam)*. *Prakarī* serves only the main story without any distinct purpose of its own. Unlike *Patākā*

it may be incidental and discontinuous. *Kārya* is the object of the main story. We have, thus, three types of sequences, the principal one and two subsidiaries, *Patākā* and *Prakarī*.[50] Thus Sugrīva and Vibhīṣaṇa are *Patākānāyakas* in the Rāma story, Vāsudeva is the *Prakarī-nāyaka* in the *Veṇīsaṁhāra*.

Four *Patākāsthānas* have been emphasized as significant elements adding to dramatic beauty. All of them contain elements of equivocation and dramatic irony. The first *Patākāsthāna* is produced when an action accidentally leads to a quite unexpected result. Here the situation is equivocal.[51] The second depends on an equivocal response and the use of *double entendre*, the third on the intimation of a hidden meaning through ambiguity in dialogue, the fourth on poetic constructions depending on words having double meanings. Some kind of ambiguity in words, dialogues and situations is a generic feature of the *Patākāsthānas* and it produces a surprising turn.

The five *sandhis* are further subdivided into sixty-four *aṅgas*.[52] These are constituents of the major divisions called *sandhis* and serve manifold purposes. They help the construction of the desired theme, maintenance of the story, the interlinking of the parts of the performance, concealing what needs to be concealed, producing surprise revelations and the discovery of things when due.[53] Thus, there are twelve *aṅgas* in the *mukha sandhi*. The indication of the theme is called *upakṣepa* and is the first *aṅga*. *Pratimukha* has thirteen *aṅgas* and so has *garbha sandhi*. *Vimarśa* has thirteen and *Nirvahaṇa* fourteen *aṅgas*. These lists and names became standard for subsequent writers.[54] Since these *aṅgas* have not been derived in any logical manner, it may be presumed that they represent an empirical classification based on the available repertoire of dramatic works. They present an abstract summary of the types of incidents and situations which frequently occurred in these works and were distinctive enough to have been appreciated and noted by critics for formalization. The use of specific devices like dreams, letters, messages, recognition, sudden reversals, play within a play, repartee, parody etc., may be mentioned as of importance.[55]

The play was divided into several Acts or *Aṅkas* although it could be of one Act also. *Aṅka* is the basic unit of performance and functioned to further the theme and mood. Each *aṅka* completed one of the *stages* or *avasthās* but ended with continuity of the *bindu*. It was to represent the action of some leading character who was to be himself directly present on the stage. It was compact and not too long, but it could have a variety of emotions. The action depicted in it was not to exceed one day and was to have unity of purpose. At

the end of the act all the characters were to leave the stage.[56] As is stated succinctly in the *Daśarūpaka*, "*Ekāhacaritaikārtham Pātraistricaturairaṅkaṁ teṣām ante'sya nirgamam*/."[57]

What could or could not be represented directly on the stage was governed by conventions. Thus rage, pleasure, sorrow, curse, marriage, miracles etc. could by shown as part of the action and experience,[58] but long journeys, killing, fighting, revolution, siege, eating, bathing, love-making etc. were not to be shown.[59] What was not or could not be directly represented in the Act, could sometimes be intimated by means of *ākāśabhāṣita*, where information was to be given through the dialogue of secondary characters as an introduction or interlude. Such an interlude could be a *Praveśaka* or *Viṣkambhaka*. The former was constituted by the dialogue of servants and other characters from lower classes using Prākṛta. It served as a short connective recalling or foreshadowing of events. The *Praveśaka* was located at the beginning of an Act. The *Viṣkambhaka* could have a dialogue in Sanskrit only or a mixed one in Sanskrit and Prākṛta.[60]

Apart from *Praveśaka* and *Viṣkambhaka*, there were several other devices for intimating events to the audience. When at the end of an *aṅka* an intimation was given of further events, that is called *aṅkāvatāra*. Where the whole story is indicated in some dialogue, we have *aṅkamukha*. Where a speech or dialogue behind the curtain is used to give information we have *cūlikā*.[61]

The play began with a general Prologue, an idea which had impressed the German poet Goethe. After a number of song and dance items, the first dramatic item in the *Pūrvaraṅga* consisted of the *Nāndī* or a ceremonial prayer offered for the guarding of the play from obstacles.[62] The *Sūtradhāra* recited the *Nāndī* in *madhyama svara*. The *Nāndī* was to be of twelve or eight *padas* and expressed a benediction for the gods, Brāhmaṇas and rulers. The *Pūrvaraṅga* had a large number of elements of which twenty-two have been mentioned. An important element was *Prarocanā* or Introduction. The *Sūtradhāra* and/or *Sthāpaka*, *Pāripārśvika* and *Naṭī* constituted the characters of the *Pūrvaraṅga*. Among other elements of *Pūrvaraṅga*, items of dance and music entered in complex patterns. The extent to which the elements and complications of *Pūrvaraṅga* were actually followed varied with time and place. The Prologue appears to have been gradually simplified in practice.[63]

Dramatic representation is held to be rooted in the style or manner of department. "Style is the mother of Drama"—*Vṛttayo nāṭyamātaraḥ*'. Abhinava says, "Although the movements of body, speech

and mind accompanied with picturesque diversity constitute the 'styles' *(vṛttis)* and although pervading the whole living world, they flow together at the same time, even so joined to a characteristic inspiration *(āveśa)* of the heart ('being possessed by the heart') they assist dramatic performance. This inspiration or 'possession', which may be more or less, is two-fold—belonging to ordinary life or that lying beyond it. The heightened emotional state of everyday life caused by the gradation of pain and pleasure is not aesthetically enjoyable. The 'transcendental', heightened emotion although not really a state of emotion appears like one as is in the case of the poet or spectator. What flashes on special occasions to an aesthetically sensitive and emotionally attuned mind *(hṛdayāsamvādasarasasya)* becomes the instrument of a peculier function which forms the content of aesthetic experience in 'normal' representation. This was first demonstrated by Lord Vāsudeva at the beginning of Kṛtayuga."[64] The *NŚ* recalls the myth[65] that once, when Lord Acyuta was asleep in his 'snake bed' and the entire cosmos had been reduced to the ocean of unmanifested being, the intoxicated demons, Madhu and Kaiṭabha, started a fight with the god and engaged in abusive shouts and violent movements. At the request of Brahmā, who was struck with wonder and awe, Madhusūdana reassured him, engaged in diverse movements, and killed the demons. With Brahmā as the first spectator Hari, thus, created the *vṛttis*. His speech gave rise to *Bhāratī*, the steady twanging of his bow led to *Sāttvatī*, the tying of the hair accompanied by wonderous *aṅgahāras* led to the *Kaiśikī*, and the vigorous and violent movements of his fight with the demons led to the *Ārabhaṭī*. *Bhāratī* being the manner of dialogue was connected with the *Ṛgveda*, *Sāttvatī* being the manner of representation *(abhinayapradhāna)* was connected with the *Yajurveda*, *Kaiśikī* being the manner of singing etc., was connected with the *Sāmaveda* and *Ārabhaṭī* with its passion and vehemence was connected with the *Atharvaveda*.

Abhinava explains that since speech, thought and action are inseparably connected, the *vṛttis*, too, are not independent. They are counted separately only because one or another out of them may acquire predominance on any given occasion.[66] *Bhāratī* is verbal *(vākpradhāna)* used by men rather than women and connected with dialogues in Sanskrit.[67] Its four parts of special occasions are *Prarocanā*, *Āmukha*, *Vīthī* and *Prahasana*.[68] *Prarocanā* indicates the subject of the drama and is, as stated before, a part of the *Pūrvaraṅga*. *Āmukha* is the same as *Prastāvanā*, and indicates the theme of the play through a dialogue beetween the *Sūtradhāra* and the *Naṭī*, *Vidūṣaka* or *Pāripārśvika*.[69] It has five forms—*Vighātyaka*, *Kathodghāta*, *Prayogātiśaya*,*Pra-*

vṛttaka and *Avalagita*. In the first, words used earlier are joined to different words; in the last they are employed in continuation by another for a different purpose. These two are also *Vīthyaṅgas*. In the *Kathodghāta* a character enters the stage using the *Sūtradhāra's* sentence or its meaning. Where the *Sūtradhāra* himself joins an answering statement to his question and then the entry of the character takes place, we have an example of *Prayogātiśaya*. Where the character enters after the description of time, we have *Pravṛttakam*.[70] The constituents of *Vīthī* and *Prahasana* would be mentioned below.

Sāttvatī vṛtti is distinguished by high-mindedness and cheerful exuberance.[71] It includes vocal and bodily acting for representing mental states characteristic of heroism, nobility, enthusiasm and contest. It is suitable for the moods of *Vīra*. *Adbhuta* and *Raudra*, but not for *Śṛṅgāra*, *Karuṇa*, and *Nirveda*. It belongs to contexts having bold heroes indulging in mutual disparagement.[72] Its four varieties are *Utthāpaka*, *Parivartaka*, *Sallāpaka* and *Saṁghātya*.[73] In the first an open challenge is thrown for rivals or enemies. In the second, there is an unexpected change of plan. Another explanation conceives *Parivartaka* as connected with three kinds of humour (*trihāsyasaṁyuktaḥ*). This, however, is ignored by Abhinava. In the *Sallāpaka*, there is denunciation or disparagement. In the *Saṁghātyaka*, diplomatic means or intrigue is used to break down a hostile alliance.[74]

Kaiśikī is distinguished by grace and delicacy with a profusion of women characters, dance and music. Erotic and romantic situations abound and the dress, make-up etc. are delicate and diverse.[75] Its four varieties are *Narma*, *Narmasphañja*, *Narmasphoṭa* and *Narmagarbha*. The first abounds in humorous dialogues and romantic interest. The mood of heroism is absent but jealousy, annoyance and sarcasm may be expressed or an attempt may be made to win over another's heart. In the *Narmasphañja*, there is a meeting of new lovers, but it ends in the fear of discovery.[76] In the *Narmasphoṭa* diverse other feelings serve to further manifest the basic mood of love. Where the hero acts secretly or under a disguise we have *Narmagarbha*.[77]

Ārabhaṭī is used in the situations involving bold and impassioned moods *(uddhatarasa, dīptarasa)*. Its qualities are rage, violence etc. and it is also replete with deception, boasting and false words.[78] Its varieties are *Saṅkṣiptaka*, *Avapāta*, *Vastūtthāpana* and *Sampheṭa*.[79] The first is so named because it brings together on stage many artificially produced devices and unusual make-up. *Avapāta* has rapid action on the stage with characters entering and leaving out of fear and joy, commotion caused by words, falling and jumping, and hasty

movements. *Vastūtthāpana* indicates future developments, includes all kinds of moods briefly and may or may not depend on commotion caused by fire etc. *Sampheṭa* has violence, fighting, much use of weapons etc.[80]

From the above it would be clear that although the concept of *vṛtti* was held in high esteem, in the *NŚ* its delineation suffered from a confusion between style and manner on one hand, and theme and context on the other. Thus, the features used to characterize the *vṛttis* are sometimes stylistic, at others thematic and contextual. The stylistic distinctions are clear and basic. *Bhāratī* is a linguistic or verbal style or diction with emphasis on articulation as illustrated by the male use of Sanskrit. The other three styles are of representation primarily by acting and the use of accessories. Thus *Kaiśikī* uses female actors, dance, music and make-up. It is the essentially graceful or delicate style of acting and representation. *Sāttvatī* and *Ārabhaṭī* are both characterised by energy and vigour, but while the *Sāttvatī* is the style of high-minded heroism and nobility, *Ārabhaṭī* is characterised by violence, impetuosity and fighting. Thus *Bhāratī*, *Sāttvatī*, *Ārabhaṭī* and *Kaiśikī vṛttis* may be rendered as the eloquent, the noble, the martial and the graceful styles of dramatic representation. The predominance of any one of them was relevant to the expression of particular moods or *rasas*. *Kaiśikī* was prescribed for humour or romance, *Sāttvatī* for heroism and marvel (and an apparently later *V.1.* adds 'peace'), *Ārabhaṭī* for rage or fear, and *Bhāratī* for disgust and pity. It would be noted here that while the affiliations proposed for the first three cases have obvious justice, the affiliations proposed for *Bhāratī* has hardly any. *Bībhatsa* ought to have gone with *Raudra* and *Bhayānaka*, *Karma* too, is the consequence of *Raudra*, and should possibly be classed there. *Bhāratī* is, indeed, not a style characterized by any specific theme, context or mood, but the manner in which words are used. It would, therefore belong to all the *rasas* but would be coloured differently in different cases.[81]

The etymology of these names of the *vṛttis* is as obscure as is their origin. *Bhāratī* has been derived from *Bharata* meaning an actor—possibly *Bharatas* were not just any actors, but actors skilled in speech and eloquence. On the other hand, Bhāratī was one of the Āprī devatās and formed a distinct group with Iḷā and Sarasvatī, and later came to be identified with Sarasvatī as the goddess of speech and learning. This suggests that in *Bhāratī vṛtti*, we have a meeting of two different sources viz. *Bhāratī* as speech and *Bhāratī* as the manner or style of actors skilled in speech. *Sāttvatī* has been derived by Abhinava from *sat* in the sense of light or consciousness—"*Sātt-*

vato guṇaḥ mānaso vyāpāraḥ. Sat sattvam prakāśaḥ tad vidyate yatra tat sattvam manaḥ tasmin bhāvaḥ." Elsewhere he says *sat* is cognitive or intuitive experience (*prakhyārūpam saṁvedanam).*[82] As the same time we have to remember that Sāttvats were, like the Bharatas a famous clan with which Vāsudeva was connected and it is Vāsudeva who is declared in the *NŚ* to be the originator of the *Vṛttis*. Here, too, we seem to have a dual origin, from *Sattva* as well as *Sattvat*. *Ārabhaṭī* has been derived from *ara-bhaṭa* meaning 'alert warriors'. The use of *ara* in this sense was common enough in the *Vedas* but *bhaṭa* seems to be a later word, perhaps a prākṛtism from *bhṛta* meaning a hired soldier. The *Arthaśāstra* distinguishes *maula* from *bhṛta*. It is possible that the old adjective *ara* continued to be used with *bhaṭa* as a popular stereotyped compound. *Kaiśikī* has been derived from *keśa* or hair. Perhaps hair played an important part in the style, either because male actors needed them specially to play female roles or in the case of female actors hair styles were a primary means of decoration. *Kaiśika* also had the sense of 'fine as a hair' and could thus signify some thing subtle or delicate. It was also the name of a musical melody and later lexicons give 'tone' as one of its meanings. Most interestingly, it also refers to a Yādava clan. Thus *Kaiśikī* too seems to have had a dual source, literal and tribal.

The origin of the four *vṛttis*, thus, may be placed in the co-operation of different types of performances in the theatre. There were skilled locutionists, the Bharatas; there were dancers who skillfully displayed emotions and mimed *tableaux* well-known in myth and festival, the superior *nartakas*; there were acrobats, tumblers, wrestlers, mimics etc., the inferior actors or *naṭas* with physical rather than expressive skill, and there were the women singers, actresses, costume-makers, make-up artists, hair-dressers, decorators etc. Each group contributed a distinct aspect to the total performance and when emphasized could set its tone. The concept of *vṛttis* goes back to this early history of the theatre as an act of diverse and mixed skills.[83] As the concept became gradually stereotyped, it ceased to be source of any further development, although lip-service continued to be paid to it.

Along with the four *vṛttis*, Bharata mentions four *pravṛttis* which reflect the diversity of regional usage and styles.[84] It has been agreed that while *vṛttis* are principally concerned with expression, the *pravṛttis* are concerned with communication.[85] Actually, however, it would be more accurate to think of *pravṛttis* as regionally fashionable styles of theatric representations. These styles are a mixture of social and linguistic usage with dramatic and theatric conventions. As men-

tioned before, *abhinaya* has been defined in the *NŚ* as the representation of a meaning to the spectators by diverse histrionic means such as speech, acts, appearance etc., and has been described as four-fold—*āṅgika*, *vācika*, *sāttvika* and *āhārya*.[86] The first uses bodily gestures and movements, the second speech and intonation, the third expressive manipulations of the body and the fourth costumes, make-up and scenic effects. *Āṅgika* uses the movements of six major and minor limbs. The former are the head, hands, waist, breast, sides and feet. The minor limbs are the eyes, eyebrows, lower lip, cheeks and chin. *Śākhā*, *aṅkura* and *nṛtta* are the three main varieties of *āṇgika*. The first two are flourishes of the gesticulating hand preceding and following the speech. *Nṛtta* or pure dance is composed of the definite sequences of the combined movements of hands and feet called *aṅgahāras*. These are discussed in a separate chapter.

Speech is described as the body of drama and *vācika abhinaya* is central.[87] The dialogue or recitation may be in Sanskrit or Prakrit and the author of the play as well as the actor used to pay due attention to the sounds, grammar, prosody and figures of speech of the language concerned. Equally important was the attention to be given to *Kāku*.[88] Dramatic speech required not only the realistic rendering of natural speech in all variety of situations but the manner in which speech was effected by sickness, old-age, childhood, death-bed, dream, fight, hurry etc., was also to be carefully represented. When long speeches or narrations were to be made they were to be rendered vivid, intelligible and effective by constant attention to gestures, movements and modulations of the voice. Conventional gestures were used to convey that the speech was a soliloquy (*svagata*) or a whisper (*karṇe*) or an aside (*janāntika*) or a secret shared by a character with the audience (*apavāritaka)*. For the aside, thus, the gesture called *tripatāka hasta* was used. *Ākāśabhāṣita* meant a conversation with a character supposed to be invisibly present.[89] The *lāsyāṅgas* and the *vīthyaṅgas* were special contexts in which the use of words and their rendering contributed to beauty or to witty repartee, amusement and humour.

The representation of mental states through bodily and facial expression is *śāttvika abhinaya*. "It denotes that mode and an ability on the part of an actor whereby he concentrates his mind wholly on the mental state to be represented and renders it with convincing facial expression and physical manifestation as if the state is his own as in real life."[90] This is the real basis of the dramatic art—*Sattve nāṭyam pratiṣṭhitam*.[91] Acting in which emotional expression predominates is held to be the most excellent—*'Sattvāti'rikto'bhinayo jyeṣṭha ityabhi-*

dhiyate.[92] *Sattva* has been described by Bharata as the inner poise and concentration of mind.[93] It has also been defined as the inner unmanifest source of emotion or *bhāva.*[94] Still another definition identifies *sattva* with the body or rather physical vitality and declares that from *sattva* arises *bhāva*, from *bhāva* comes *hāva*, and from *hāva* arises *helā.*[95] Abhinava explains that these emotions arise naturally and spontaneously in different types of persons, e.g. of love in cultured women.[96] *Sattva*, thus, joins the pysche and the body as their vital link finding expression in their emotions. The psycho-physical nature of expression was well understood in the art of histrionic representation.

Apart from the five *avasthās*, five *sandhis*, five *arthaprakṛtis*, sixty-four *aṅgas*, four *vṛttis*, four *pravṛttis* and four *abhinayas*, drama is also characterized by thirty-six *lakṣaṇas* in the *NŚ.*[97] These *lakṣaṇas* appear to be a miscellaneous collection logically since they include figures of speech and thought as also types of feelings and situations. Here again, the explanation presumably lies in the practical nature of the list as representing types of elements which were of frequent occurrence in and to be attended to in dramatic performance. Thus decoration or *bhūṣaṇa* is first in the list and refers generally to the beauties of *alaṁkāras* and *guṇas*. Later theorists elaborated a list of thirty-three *nāṭyālaṁkāras.*[98] *Akṣara-saṁghāta* groups syllables to serve the purpose of equivocation. *Śobhā*, too, reveals an unexpected meaning through more familiar words. *Udāharaṇa*, *Hetu*, *Saṁśaya* and *Dṛṣṭānta* are well-known logical categories but here used as poetic figures or dramatic situations. *Prāpti*, *Abhiprāya* and *Nidarśana* refer to types of basic situations. So is *Siddhi*. *Viśeṣaṇa*, *Atiśaya*, *Tulyatarka* and *Padoccāyā* are figures of speech or diction. *Guṇātipāta* is a stylistic feature in sarcastic speech. *Diṣṭa*, *Upadiṣṭa*, *Vicāra*, *Viparyaya* and *Bhrama* are types of situations as indicated by their names. *Anunaya*, *Dākṣiṇya*, *Garhaṇā*, *Pṛcchā*, *Manoratha* and *Priyokti* are attitudes and their expression. *Arthāpatti* has resemblance to the logical figure so called. *Mālā*, *Sārūpya*, *Saṅkṣepa*, *Guṇakīrtana* and *Anuktasiddhi* are dramatic devices.

While drama may have arisen in festive-cum-ritual contests through the meeting of the theatrical and literary traditions and claimed to be as instructive as the *Vedas*, there can be no doubt that its heart was entertainment. This entertainment was, however, different from that provided by jugglers and acrobats where we admire the skill, but remain emotionally unmoved. Here was entertainment afforded by Imaginative creation or representation. This distinctive kind of experience which was produced by dramatic spectacle was called *rasa*

by Bharata and remains the central focus of his dramaturgy. It distinguishes drama from mere instruction or mere amusement. While the nature of *rasa* or aesthetic experience is discussed in another chapter, it may be stressed here that the whole structure and classification of dramatic forms in the *NŚ* depends on the classification of the *rasas* and appropriately of characters and themes.[99] Thus the eight *rasas* which Bharata knew had a distinct group of *dīpta* or glowing *rasas* of which *Raudra* is the exampler.[100] This leads to a distinction between tender *(sukumāra)* and harsh *(āviddha)* representation. The concept of *rasa* as enjoyment of the theatrical representation of emotive themes and situations was joined to the idea that what was represented should be relevant to the pursuit of some recognised human value or *puruṣārtha*.[101] This emphasis on the concern of drama with the active search for values saved it from lapsing into mere sentimentality or vulgar amusement just as the emphasis on *rasa* saved it from lapsing into mere didacticism. Dramatic representation was required at once to be realistic, idealistic and imaginative.

About the characters of drama, it has been alleged that they were represented as types.[102] The king, the queens, the ministers, the jester, the rake, the trader, the ascetic, the menials, gods and demons and others are said to be classified into neat categories of high, middle and low, noble or bold and to be no more than the images of fixed social or mythical types. This is held to rule out individual and rounded or developing characters such as may be found in Shakespeare. Unfortunately, this view misunderstands the purpose of the classification and prescriptions with respect to the characters in the *NŚ* and generalises from the practice of lesser writers. Types, especially social types, have a genuine place in any drama, but that does not by itself rule out individuality. Falstaff and Shylock represent types but are individuals nevertheless. The same is true of the *Vidūṣaka* in the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. What is more, even in the representation of a real individual, singular and common features are inevitably mixed up. The heroine of the *Śākuntala* is a highly individual person and at the same time a lovely lady. The *NŚ* lays down general prescriptions for the vivid representation of heroes and heroines drawn from life, legend and myth. If they donot appear alive, the representation would be unsuccessful. That the *NŚ* and the dramatists intended vividly alive characters in significant action can hardly be denied. But they can not be blamed for not taking into account the modern philosophy of social individualism in the analysis of drama.[103]

The *NŚ* is heir to a vastly varied dramatic tradition. It describes

ten major types of plays, the *daśarpūpakas*. We are told that the first play staged by Bharata at the instance of Brahmā was the *Samavakāra* entitled *Amṛta-manthana*. The *Ḍima Tripuradāha* was similarly staged by him at the request of Brahmā as a spectacle before Śiva.[104] This suggests that the more ancient dramatic forms had mythical themes and the atmosphere of conflict and commotion. They lacked the *Kaiśikī vṛtti* and the atmosphere of romance and humour. Spectacles of fighting, stampede and intrigue predominated. In the *NŚ*, infact, it is plainly stated that the *Kaiśikī vṛtti* and female characters were added later on. Perhaps myths relating to titanic conflicts were mimed on the occasion of the festival of Indra's Banner and these must have been replete with spectacles of strife, commotion, stampede and flurry and the air of martial violence and impetuosity. Erotic interest was not wholly ruled out and competitive struggle in its pursuit was permitted in some forms. The heroes were generally superhuman, olympian *(devas)* and titanic *(asuras)*. *Samavakāra*, *Īhāmṛga* and *Ḍima* exemplify these mythic-heroic forms. *Vyāyoga* has a general similarity but it includes men as contenders and may be described as heroic-martial.

Bharata gives the following characteristics of *Samavakāra*.[105] The story arises from the striving of *devas* and *asuras* for success *(devāsura-bījakṛtaḥ)*, the heroes are eminent and sublime gods, there are three acts, three deceptions *(kapaṭas)*, three commotions *(trividravas)* and three romances *(trisṛṅgāra)*. There are twelve heroes. The duration of the action was limited to eighteen *nāḍikas* or nine *muhūrtas*. The first Act covered the action of twelve *nāḍīs* and represented spectacles of deception, commotion and successful erotic enterprize which included elements of wit and farce. The second Act depicted the action of four *nāḍikas*, the third of two *nāḍikas*. The themes *(artha)* were not closely knit *(apratisambandham)*. The commotions *(vidrava)* could be due to war or flood, wind or fire, elephants or siege. The deception *(kapaṭa)* could be due to one's own course of action or due to another's or due to fate. *Śṛṅgāra* too, may be associated with virtue and religion, or money and means or erotic passion. There could thus be a diversity of *rasas*, but the grace of song and dance or delicate romance was absent. Abhinava has a contemptuous comment on this most ancient form of drama. "Thus devotees of gods are pleased by such performances on the occasions of the festive *yātrās* of these gods. It is the people with unimaginative hearts, women, children and fools who are attracted by such spectacles of commotion."[106]

Īhāmṛga is similar, representing divine heroes engaged in strife

for a superhuman female *(divyastrī)*. It has, unlike *Samavakāra*, a well knit theme. It has disputes, intrepid heroes, agitation, commotion, contest, abduction and carrying away of women by force. Like the *Vyāyoga* it has a dozen heroes in strife, but a few women, only one act and the duration of action is one day. In *Vyāyoga*, however, the heroes are not divine but human like sage-kings *(rājarṣis)* engaged in fighting and fisticuffs *(niyuddha)*. In *Īhāmṛga* actual fighting is postponed by some ruse.[107]

The *Ḍima*[108] has eminent and noble heroes, mostly superhuman *(devādayo bāhulyenātra)* and sixteen in number. It has four acts, a well-known story, six *rasas* (i.e. all except *Sṛṅgāra* and *Hāsya*). Its poetry has an impassioned air *(dīptarasa)*, there are numerous emotions, spectacles of thunder, lightening, eclipses of the sun and moon, fighting, fisticuffs, duel, magic, much use of theatrical properties, and a plethora of gods, *nāgas*, *rākṣasas*, *yakṣas* and *piśācas*.[109] *Sāttvatī* and *Ārabhaṭī* are the two prominent *vṛttis* employed.

Like *Īhāmṛga* and *Vyāyoga* a number of other forms had only one act. These were *Aṅka*, *Prahasana*, *Bhāṇa* and *Vīthī*. *Aṅka* had only human characters, its leading sentiment was *Karuṇa* with the wailing of women and a situation of despair and resignation following catastrophe. *Prahasana*[110] or farce, too, was of one act but had two varieties, pure and mixed. In the former, the characters are ascetics, priests etc. who are not naturally the objects of ridicule but become its butt owing to the distortion of language and conduct. In the latter or mixed variety we have roles of prostitutes, slaves, the rake *(viṭa)*, villain etc. In both the forms the theme is some social custom or hypocracy and the ambivalence of crooks masqurading as ascetics etc. The *Prahasana* included the diverse constituents of the *Vīthī (Vīthyaṅga)*.[111]

The *Bhāṇa* not only had one act, but also a single character who spoke aloud conversing with others not actually presented on the stage. He spoke of his own experiences with proper histrionic representations. He could be a crooked rake *(dhūrta viṭa)* and his experiences could relate to similar knaves and prostitutes. The sentiments of the adventure could be heroic and romantic. In a way, it is the simplest and most elementary of the dramatic forms where a single actor is engaged in mono-acting and could be a historically primitive form also. An evidence of this is furnished by the fact that the ten constituents of *lāsya (lāsyāṅgāni)* have been intimately connected with *Bhāṇa*.[112] These *lāsyāṅgas* are moods of delicate dance and music utilized as standard devices in dramatic situations and speeches. These are (i) *Geyapada* which Bharata defines as the wordless singing

(śuṣka) of singers on the stage accompanied by the orchestra. Apparently, the singing was a background providing a tune with a relevant air. But later on it was defined as the singing of a song by the heroine to the accompaniment of lute. Abhinava also rejects the older interpretation of *śuṣka* as *nirgīta*. He interprets *śuṣka* as 'bereft of imitation. (ii) *Sthitapāṭhya* is the singing of a Prakrit song by a lovelorn lady in separation. But Sāgaranandin defines it as a kind of singing along with dancing. (iii) *Āsīna* shows the heroine seated in a condition of anxiety and despondance without any orchestral support. (iv) *Puṣpagaṇḍikā* is a mixed sequence of dance and song especially to elicit the feeling of men. Alternative definitions speak of a female character in male attire reciting in Sanskrit. (v) *Pracchedaka* has the heroine, even though aggrieved, turning to the lover as she is smitten by moonlight. (vi) *Trimūḍha* has three characters in a fix, viz., the hero for his fault, the first heroine for having been wronged, and the new heroine out of bashfulness and first love. (vii) *Saindhavaka* has speeches in *saindhava* Prakrta. (viii) *Dvimūḍhaka* brings out the confusion of the hero and heroine or of the two heroines. (ix) *Uttamottamaka* has a variety of *rasas*, and expressions of romance natural to youth. (x) *Uktapratyukta* has the heroine in the contrary moods of anger and pleasure, conversing with the hero in a real or imaginary manner, accompanied with music. The *NŚ* also mentions *Citrapada* where the heroine alleviates her sorrow of separation by looking at a picture and *Bhāvika* where she sees the lover in a dream. Abhinava rejects these as *lāsyāṅgas* saying that there are only ten of them. He argues that the ten *aṅgas* are drawn from *lāsya* to subserve *rasa*.[113] This could be with respect to the principal mental state, or the *vibhāva* etc. or with respect to the accessories. Thus *Saindhavaka* was used in the *vācika abhinaya* such as *kāku*, *dvimūḍhaka* in *āṅgika*, *āsīnapāṭhya*, in *sāttvika*, *uktapratyukta* in *vācika*, *geyapada* in the musical accessories, *puṣpagaṇḍikā* in music as well as *āhārya*, *sthitapāṭhya* in *lakṣaṇa*, *guṇa* etc., *trimūḍhaka* in *anuvṛtta*[114] etc., *uttamottamaka* in the *vyabhicārīs* and *pracchedaka* in the *cittavṛttis*. This exhausts all the ten and according to Abhinava all the aspect of *nāṭya* also !

Vīthī was another of the single act plays.[115] Abhinava describes it as the source utilized by all the varities of drama from *Nāṭikā* to *Bhāṇa* since it displays diverse *rasas* and its constituents are universally useful.[116] If *Bhāṇa* is a monologue recounting amorous adventures, *Vīthī* is above all a dialogue full of witty repartees and amusing sallies. It could have one or two characters belonging to any of the three types, high, middling or low. Its main feature was the use of thir-

teen constituents *(Vīthyaṅgas): Udghātyaka, Avalagitaka, Avasapandita, Nālī, Asatpralāpa, Vākkeli, Prapañca, Mṛdava, Adhibala, Chala, Trigata, Vyāhāra* and *Gaṇḍa*. In *Udghātyaka* the words of one character are completed by another. Abhinava explains it as a series of questions and answers. In the *Avalagitaka* the continuation of words in the response seeks to carry the action towards another end. Where an auspicious or inauspicious meaning is implied but another is uttered skillfully, we have *Avaspandita* which like the throbbing of eye-lids gives a sudden intimation. *Nālikā* is answering a riddle so as to hide the real answer in good humour. Where the real and well-intentioned meaning is missed but the apparent and pleasing meaning accepted in the answer we have *asatpralāpa*. In *Vākkeli* a single answer is given to a number of questions. In *Prapañca* there is a jocular lie about some relationship but it serves some purpose also of one of them. *Mṛdava* turns virtues into faults and *vice versa* out of a dispute. *Adhibala* has a series of verbal exchanges in which new meanings emerge. In *Chala* a clear remark causes anger to some, amusement to another, and at the same time serves its real purpose. Where several meanings may be constructed in a remark with or without humour, there is *Trigata* or multiple implication. Where a remark accidentally indicates some future spectacle, that is *Vyāhāra*. In *Gaṇḍa* there is commotion and agitation and an almost completed utterance gets linked and distorted by another with a dire meaning.

All these eight types of plays described above were devoid of the *Kaiśikī vṛtti*. They either presented violent spectacles of contest and commotion or exchanges of wit and humor. They tended either towards unbridled fury and pathos or towards equally unbridled laughter. In the case of *Ḍima, Samavakāra, Vyāyoga* and *Īhāmṛga*. the dominant *rasas* are *Vīra* and *Raudra*, which are connected with the pursuit of *dharma* or *artha*. Abhinava, therefore, regards them as having an inner value-constraint. *Āṅka, Prahasana* and *Bhāṇa*, however, tend to concentrate wholly on popular entertainment and sob-appeal—"*Utsṛṣṭikāṅkaprahasanabhāṇāstu karuṇahāsya-vismaya-pradhānatvād rañjakarasapradhānāḥ*.[117] Hence only an immature audience is likely to appreciate such pure comic or pure tragic spectacles. "*Ata evātra strībalāmūrkhādir adhikārī*".[118] Their story and theme, too, are extremely limited.

Despite their seriousness *Ḍima, Samavakāra, Īhāmṛga* and *Vyāyoga* were deficient in human characters and lacked the delicate grace of *Kaiśikī*. *Aṅka, Prahasana* and *Bhāṇa* tended to lack high-minded seriousness. Hence the two forms which Bharata declares to be the proper paradigms of theatrical representation are *Nāṭaka* and *Praka-*

rana.[119] They have been interpreted as heroic and bourgeois comedies respectively.[120] This characterisation does not wholly fit these types. Since the denoument was required not to be unhappy and the death of the hero was excluded except in *Aṅka*, *Nāṭaka* and *Prakaraṇa* were not tragic in the sense which requires tragedies to end in death and gloom. However, both the *Nāṭaka* and *Prakaraṇa* observed all the five *sandhis*, which meant that the development of the plot has to pass through a serious crisis where things look bleak indeed. As a result, plays like *Abhijñānaśākuntala*, *Mṛcchakaṭika*, *Uttararāmacarita* or *Veṇīsaṁhāra* can hardly be described as comic. The fact is that the division of dramatic types into tragedy, comedy, melodrama etc., does not do justice to the actual configurations and richness of the drama as visualized by Bharata.[121]

Prof. Raghavan has argued that the *Nāṭaka* and *Prakaraṇa* represent two distinct basic types viz., the heroic play and the social play.[122] There were two different lines of evolution. One line passed through the mythological and semi-mythological types such as *Ḍima*, *Samavakāra*, *Īhāmṛga* and *Vyāyoga* culminating in *Nāṭaka* where the heroes were exalted epic kings and the *Kaiśikī vṛtti* was added. The length of the play was extended to five or more acts, all the *sandhis* and *vṛttis* were to be introduced. The ruling sentiment could be heroism and romance, but other sentiments were not neglected.

The other line of development ran through the *vīthī* which was "a verbal affair, a series of witty exchanges", the *Bhāṇa* a monologue recounting romantic adventures, and the *Prahasana* which presented "a slice of life" with humor and satire. The trend was perfected in the *Prakaraṇa*. The *Nāṭaka* deals with aristocracy and high ideals. *Prakaraṇa* holds up the mirror up to nature and depicts "society as it is in its rank and file." It "gives life's medley" and a "variety of incidents and individuality of character." It tended to be realistic and by reducing the *Kaiśikī* tended to present the tragic within the Indian context.

Despite their contrast, the *Nāṭaka* and *Prakaraṇa* tended to meet in the *Nāṭikā* which acquired a lighter and romantic character though within an aristocratic setting. On the other hand, the *Prakaraṇa* tended to acquire the idealism of the *Nāṭaka* and a form called *Prakaraṇikā* was known, at least later.

The reconstruction of Prof. Raghavan certainly presents a great development over the earlier views of such scholars as Prof. A. B. Keith. It agrees with the hypothesis mentioned earlier that the ancient dramatic forms had a dual origin viz., in the representation of mythical contests and in the humorous and satirical representation of

social manners and classes. This duality came to be reflected in the developed forms also. However, it stands to reason that the two remained connected throughout. The festive occasions when they were staged would have been similar. Such a connection existed, for example, in case of tragic and comic drama in ancient Greece.[123] An element of satire cannot be ruled out of the mythic-heroic plays. The word *ḍima* suggests an etymology in terms of *dambha* which stood for pretence or hypocracy. The inclusion of *kapaṭa* as an element in the *Samavakāra* could not have been intended to flatter the gods or only to conform to ancient myths. On the other hand, the *Bhāṇa* had an element of heroic adventure. Besides, both the types lacked the *Kaiśikī* and one cannot think of the *Nāṭaka* or the *Prakaraṇa* without it. It is the introduction of poetry, dance and music that transformed the ancient mythic mimes and social farces. Although Bharata does not list pure dance and music operas which were designated *uparūpakas* in the later times,[124] their existence at a popular level need not be doubted. It is the combination of musical operas and dances, and of heroic epic poetry with the older mimic tradition that presumably led to the complex forms of *Nāṭaka* and *Prakaraṇa*. Both, however, are representation of social classes, aristocratic, bureaucratic and bourgeois in different proportions and both contain a mixture of idealism and realism. The mere fact that the *Nāṭaka* had a famous epic king as the hero and a heroic legend as its story and that the *Prakaraṇa* has heroes from classes below the ruler—Brāhmaṇa, Vaiśya, secretary, priest, minister or merchant—and drew its story from a work of fiction or could invent it, did not demarcate them absolutely though it initialy did give the *Nāṭaka* a more conservative and the *Prakaraṇa* a more innovative air.

Footnotes

1 *Daśarūpakam* with the comy. of Dhanika (Bombay, 1927) p. 5.

2 *Ibid.*, 1, 9.

3 *NŚ*, 7, 5-10.

4 *Daśarūpaka*, l.c.

5 Cf. *Dharmādipuruṣārtha-catuṣṭaye sādhye vāgaṅgasattva-ceṣṭāsāmānyam.*" *AB* (G O S ed.), Vol. I, p. 20; *Pravṛttirūpo netṛvyāpārasvabhāvovṛttiḥ*"—*Daśarūpaka*, p. 88.

6 "*Aśakyaḥ puruṣaiḥ sa tu prayokum strījanādṛte*"—*NŚ*, 1, 46.

7 Cf. *NŚ*, 18, 4 "*mātṛkā vṛttayaḥ smṛtāḥ*"—*Sāhityadarpaṇa*, 6, 123. "*Sarvanāṭyasya mātṛkāḥ.*"

8 *NŚ*, 14, 2.

9 This is implied in the *NŚ* version of the origin of *nāṭya* in which

female actresses and *Kaiśikī* are mentioned as later additions—*Athāha māṁ suraguruḥ Kaiśikīmapi yojaya (NŚ*, 1. 42).

10 *Ibid.*, 1. 7 ff.

11 *Ibid.*, 1. 8.

12 *Ibid.*, 1. 9.

13 *Ibid* , 1. 10.

14 *Ibid.*, 1. 11—*Krīḍanīyakam icchāmo dṛśyaṁ śravyam ca yad bhavet.*

15 *Ibid.*, 1. 12.

16 *Ibid.*, 1. 13, 16-18.

17 *Ibid.*, 1. 10-41.

18 *Ibid.*, 1. 42-53.

19 *Ibid.*, 1. 55-56.

20 *Ḍimı samavakārehāmṛgādīnām anyatamaḥ prayogaḥ prāstāvītyarthaḥ* —*AB*, Vol. I, p. 26.

21 *NŚ*, 4. 2-10 mention these two plays, one staged at the instance of Brahmā, the other before Śiva.

22 *Ibid.*, 1. 64 ff.

23 *Bhavatām devatānām śubhāśubhavikalpakaḥ/*
karma-bhāvānyayāpekṣī nāṭyavedo mayā kṛtaḥ//
Naikāntato'tra bhavatām devānam cānubhavanam/
Trailokyasyasya sarvasya nāṭyam bhāvānukīrtanam//
—*Ibid.*, 1. 106-107.

24 Cf. *Kavir ekaḥ prajāpatiḥ*—*Dhvanyāloka*, p. 498.

25 Aristotle's *Poetics*, Chap. IV; Lucas, *Tragedy*, p. 80.

26 Cf. *Kṛtayuge sattvapradhāne svadharma-mātraniṣṭho loko na sukha-duhkhe prati heyopādeyatvā prayasyati. Tretāyān tu rājasatvā-ddhukhaṁ jihasati sukham ca prepsati, rajasasyacalatvāt. Tadāsau śāstrīyeṣu rājaniyantranayā pravartyate. Tatra ca tādṛg upāyo nirū-pyo yena svayām eṣam bhavati pravṛttiḥ. Tacca nāṭyameveti.* —*AB*, Vol. I. p. 11.

27 *karma-bhāvānyayāpekṣī nāṭyavedo mayā kṛtaḥ*—*NŚ*. 1, 106.

28 Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, ‡ 22; G.C. Pande, *Foundations of Indian Culture*, Vol. I, p. 27.

29 *NŚ*, 1. 79.

30 Keith, *Sanskrit Drama*, pp. 295, 355.

31 *AB*, Vol. I, pp. 36-37—*Tadid amanukīrtanam anuvyavasāyaviśeso nāṭyāparaparyāyaḥ. Nānukāra iti'bhramtavyam.* He adds that imitation produces ridicule. Besides imitation is impossible and there is no proper object for it. "*Anukāreṇa tu kim aparādham na kiñcid asambhavād ṛte. Anukāra iti hi sadṛśakaraṇam. Tat kasya. Na tāvad Rāmādeḥ Tasyāhanukāryatvāt.*" Nor are the mental states of Rāma etc., imitated by the actor because he does not have any

such feelings. He only exhibits the *anubhāvas* which from a generic class—*Sādhāraṇarūpasya kaḥ kena sādṛśyārthaḥ.* Drama is thus an introspective or reflective or intuitive experience—*Tasmādanuvyavasāyātmakam kīrtanam rūṣitavikalpasaṁvedanaṁ nāṭyam* ....*Na tvanukaraṇarūpam.* If, however, one means by imitation a representation in conformity to social life, there is no harm—*yadi tvevam mukhyalaukika-karaṇānu-sāritayā anukaraṇam ityucyate tanna kaścid doṣaḥ.*

32 see *NŚ*, 13. 72-74, on *Lokadharmī* and *Nāṭyadharmī.*

33 Cf. *Dhvanyāloka* (p. 336) — *Na hi kaver itivṛttamātra nirvahaṇena kiñcitprayojanam.*

34 Cf. *Kāvyaprakāsa* (1.3)—*Kāntā-sammitatayopadeśayuje*

35 Cf. *NŚ*, 19. 139:
Pañcasandhi-caturvṛtti catuḥṣaṣṭhyaṅgascṁyutam/
Sattriṁśallakṣanopetaṁ guṇālaṅkārabhūṣitam//

35a Cf. *Daśarūpaka*, 1.11—*Vastune tā rasasteṣām bhedako vastu ca tridhā.*

36 Aristotle, *Poetics* (annoted tr. V. Rai, Delhi, 1984):"Every tragedy, therefore, must have six parts, which parts determine its quality—namely, plot, character, diction, thought, spectacle, song."

37 *Ibid., l.c.* "But most important of all is the organization of the incident. For tragedy is an imitation, not of men, but of an action and of life... Hence the plot is the end of tragedy, and the end is the chief thing of all." The concept of 'end' may be compared with that of *phala*. For Aristotle, character determines qualities while action determines happiness and unhappiness. So far Aristotelian ideas are similar to Indian, but Aristotle believes in the intervention of fate, *Anangke.* which will act blindly. The conception of poetic justice as a ruling principle of the cosmos was not acceptable to Greek rationalism.

38 Aristotle's definition of the tragedy does not include the death of the hero as a necessary part—*Ibid.*, p. 83. "Tragedy, then, is an imitation of an action that is serious, complete and of a certain magnitude......" He describes reversal *(pieripeteia)* and recognition as the most powerful elements of tragedy. Both of these are well illustrated in the *Śākuntala*, the *Svapnavāsavadattā* and the *Mṛcchakaṭika*; cf. R. Vaghavan, *The Social Play in Sanskrit*, p. 5. "To regret again and again that the so-called tragedy is impossible in Sanskrit may be all right in writers whose minds are fed on the Hellenistic heritage, but within the Indian scheme, the *Prakaraṇa* does represent the tragic element in a conspicuous manner. Even theory recognises it." He refers to the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* of Rāma-

candra and Guṇacandra where *rasa* is *sukha-dukhātmaka*.

39 *NŚ*, 19. 1. *Itivṛttam tu nāṭyasya śarīram prakīrtitam*; Abhinava comments : "*itivṛtta-śabdavācyaṁ tad vastu śarīram rasaḥ punarātmā*" (*AB*, Vol. III, p. 1).

40 *NŚ*, 19. 1-2.

41 *Ibid.*, 19. 2-4.

42 *Ibid.*, 19. 5.

43 *AB*, Vol. III, pp. 4-5.

44 *NŚ*, 19. 7-13.

45 *Ibid.*, 19. 37.

46 *Ibid.*, 19. 39-43.

47 *Ibid.*, 19. 17-18.

48 *Ḍimādināyakāstvatyuddhataprāyatvād nātīva vinipātam āśankante ......Prahasanādināyakāstu adharmapräytavāditivṛttasya carvitaparīratvād upakramopasaṁhāramatre viśrāmyantī tyapūrṇā avamarśādayaḥ.*

49 *NŚ*, 19. 20-21.

50 *Ibid.*, 19. 22-29.

51 *Ibid.*, 19. 30-34.

52 *Ibid.*, 19. 57-67.

53 *Ibid.*, 19. 51-52.
Iṣṭasyārthasya racanā vṛttāntasyānupakṣayaḥ/
Rāgaprāptiḥ prayogasya guhyānām caiva gūhanam//
Āścaryavad abhikhyānam prakāśyānām prakāśanam/
Āṅgānām ṣaḍvidham hyetad dṛṣṭam śāstre prayojanam//.

54 *Ibid.*, 19. 69-104.

55 Some of these are called *sandhyantas* which are 21. *NŚ*, 19. 107-109. *Duto lekhastathā svapnaścitram mada iti smṛtam—Ibid.* 19. 109.

56 *NŚ*, 18. 18-32.

57 *Daśarūpaka*, 3. 36-37.

58 *Ibid.*, 18. 20:
Krodhaprasādaśokāḥ śāpotsargo'tha vidravodvāhau/
Adbhutasambhava-darśanam aṅke pratyakṣajani syuḥ//

59 *Ibid.*, 18. 38; *Ibid.*, 22. 295-99.

60 *Ibid.*, 18. 37, 54-55; cf. Sāgaranandī, *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa*, Varanasi, 1972, pp. 32-38.

61 *NŚ*, 19. 110-16; cf. *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa*, pp. 41-45.

62 *NŚ*, 5. 104.

63 Bharata himself warns against spending too much time on these preliminary dance and music rituals. Cf. G.K. Bhatt, *Bharatanāṭyamañjarī*, pp. 68-69.

64 *AB*, Vol. III, pp. 83-84.
Yadyapi kāyavāṅmanasām ceṣṭā eva saha vaicitryeṇa vṛttayaḥ tā'śca samastajīva-loka-vyāpinyaḥ anidamprathamatāpravṛttāḥ pravāheṇa vahanti tathāpi viśiṣṭena hṛdayāveśena yuktā vṛttayo nāṭyopakāriṇyaḥ. Āveśaśca tāratamyalakṣaṇo dvidhā laukiko'nyaśca. Tatra laukika āveśaḥ sukhaduḥkhatāratamyakṛto na rasāgamasvādyo hyasau.........alaukikastvanāveś-o'pyāveśamayaḥ. Kaver iva sāmājikasyeva. Kvāpyavasāne hṛdayasaṁvadasarasyaiva yo bhāṣate sa eva sādhāraṇe camatkāragocaravyāpāraviśeṣaḥ rasasyopakaraṇībhavati. Tādṛśaśca prathamataḥ kṛtayugārambhe bhagavato Vāsudevasyaiva.

65 *NŚ*, 20. 2ff.

66 *AB*, Vol. III, p. 91.

67 *NŚ*, 20. 26.
Yā vākpradhānā puruṣaprayojyā
Strīvarjitā saṁskṛtapāṭhyayuktā/
Svanāmadheyair bharataih prayuktā
Sā bhāratī nāma bhavet tu vṛttiḥ//.

68 *Ibid.*, 20. 27.

69 *NŚ*, 20. 28-35; *ibid.*, 20. 36;
Prayoge tu prayogam tu sūtradhāraḥ prayojayet.
—*AB*, Vol. III, p. 95 : *sūtradhāra eva yatra prayoge prayogam samudgakakavāṭayugalavad yojayati. Sa prayogadvayāśleṣaṇāt prayogatisayaḥ*; cf. *Sāhityadarpaṇa* (Varanasi, 1970), p. 176;
"*Yadi prayoga ekasmin prayogo'nyaḥ prayujyate/*
Tena pātrapraveśaścet prayogātiśayastadā."

70 *NŚ*, 20. 37. But in *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa* (verse 127) and *Sahityadarpaṇa* (6. 37) the term used is *Pravartaka*. In the *Daśarūpaka* (3. 10), however, the word is *Pravṛttakam*.

71 *NŚ*, 20. 41.
"*Yā sattvateneha guṇena yuktā nyāyena vṛttena samantitā ca/*
Harṣotkaṭā saṁhṛta-śokabhāvā sā sāttvatī nāma bhavettu vṛttiḥ//
Abhinava comments: *Sāttvato nāmā mānaso vyāpāraḥ.*

72 *NŚ*, 20. 43.

73 *Ibid.*, 20. 44.

74 *Ibid.*, 20. 45-51.

75 *Ibid.*, 20. 53 :
Yā ślaksnanepathyaviśeṣa-citrā
strīsanyutā yā bahunṛtta-gītā/
kāmopabhoga-prabhavopacārā
Tām kaiśikīm vṛttim udāharanti//

76 *Ibid.*, 20. 56.

77 *Ibid.*, 20. 75-61.

78 *Ibid.*, 20. 64:
Arabhataprāyaguṇā tathaiva bahukapatavañcanopetā/
Dambhānṛta-vacanavati tvārabhaṭī nāmavijñeyā//
—*Ibid.*, 20. 63 has "*uddhatarasām ārabhaṭim*". Abhinava comments: *dīptarasā raudrādaya uddhatāḥ.*

79 *Ibid.*, 20. 67.

80 *Ibid.*, 20. 68-71.

81 *AB*, Vol. II, p. 96.

82 *AB* on *NŚ*, 1. 41.

83 It may be recalled that the origin of the *vṛttis* is placed in *Kṛtayuga* while the origin of *nāṭya* is placed in the *Tretā*. *NŚ*, first *adhyāya*.

84 *Caturvidhā pravṛttiścā proktā nāṭyaprayoktṛbhiḥ/*
Āvanti dākṣiṇātya ca pañcālī coḍramāgadhī//—*NŚ*, 13. 37.

85 Cf. *NŚ*, prose after 13. 37. "......*vṛttisaṁśritaiśca prayogair abhihitā deśāḥ yataḥ pravṛtticatuṣṭayam abhinirvṛttam prayogaścotpāditaḥ.*"
--*AB*, Vol. III, pp. 205-06; "*Pravṛttir bāhyārthe yasmān nivedane niśśeṣena vedanam jñāne pravṛttiśabdaḥ.*

86 *NŚ*, 8. 8-10.

87 *Ibid.*, 14. 2. "*Vāci yatnastu kartavyo nāṭyasyeṣā tanūh smṛtā.*"

88 *NŚ*, 17 is wholly devoted to *Kāku*.

89 *Ibid.*, 25. 85ff.

90 G.K. Bhatt, *Theatric Aspects of Sanskrit Drama*, pp. 119-20.

91 *NŚ*, 22, 1.

92 *Ibid.*, 22. 2.

93 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 374-75. *Iha hi sattvam nāma manaḥprabhavam tacca samāhitamanastvād ucyate. Manasaḥ samādhau sattvaniṣpattir bhavati.* The *sattva* enables the actor to indicate the signs of joy and sorrow even when he is not affected by them.

94 *Ibid.*, 22. 3. *Avyaktarūpam sattvam hi vijñeyam bhāvasaṁśrayam.*

95 *Ibid.*, 22. 6. *Dehātmakam bhavet sattvād bhāvaḥ samutthitaḥ/Bhāvāt samutthito hāvo hāvād helā samutthitaḥ//* Cf. *AB*, Vol, III, p. 152. "*Tha cittavṛttir eva samvedanabhūmau saṅkrāntadeham api vyāpanoti. Saiva ca sattvam ityucyate.*" The idea seems to be that when mental attitudes become an emotional experience they affect the body in characteristic ways. This capacity of the mind is *sattva.* A skilled actor is able to use this capacity even without undergoing real emotional experience.

96 *AB*, Vol. III, p. 154. *Bhāvahāvahelāstu sarvā eva sarvāsyeva sattvādhikāsūttā maṅganāsu bhavanti.*

97 *NŚ*, Ch. 16.

98 Eg. *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa*. pp. 171 ff; *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, 6. 195-98.
99 Cf. G. K. Bhatt, *Bharata-nāṭyamañjarī*. Intro., p. xvii.
100 On the number of *rasas*, vide V. Raghavan, *The Number of Rasas*. While Abhinava accepts the epithet *dīptarasa*, he regards the *rasa* as essentially pleasurable. But Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra in their *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* regard *rasa* as *sukhduḥkhātmaka*. This lends to the bifurcation of the *rasas* into pleasurable and painful.
101 Cf. *AB*, Vol. I, p. 7.
102 Eg. Keith, *Sanskrit Drama*, p. 282.
103 *NŚ*, Ch. 18.
104 *Ibid*., 4. 2-10.
105 *Ibid*., 18. 63-77.
106 *AB*, Vol. II, p. 441. *Evam śraddhālavo devetābhaktāḥ tad devayātrādāvanena prayogenānugṛhyante nīranusandhānahṛdayāḥ strībālamūrkhāśca vidravādināhṛtahṛdayāḥ kriyanta ityuktaḥ samavakāraḥ*.
107 *NŚ*, 18. 77-82, 89-93
108 *Ibid*., 18. 83-88.
109 *Ibid*., 18. 93-97.
110 *Ibid*., 18. 101-06
111 *Ibid*., 18. 107-10
112 *Ibid*., 18. 107-10.
113 *AB*, Vol. III, p. 77—*alaukikakaiśikyupayogi-rasāṁśe sarvathopakāri yad vaicitryam tad lāsyāṅga-dvārenāha*."
114 The meaning of *anuvṛtta* is not clear. The *Bharatakośa* gives several meanings but they do not illumine this context.
115 *NŚ*, Vol. II, pp. 453 ff.
116 *AB*, Vol. II, pp. 452-53 : *Nāṭikādi-bhāṇānta-samastarūpakopajīvyatvād vīthīm lakṣayati*.
117 *Ibid*., Vol. II, p. 451.
118 *Ibid*.
119 *NŚ*, 18. 7. *AB*, Vol. II, p. 434 *Tatra pradhānabhūtayoḥ sarvarūpakaprasaraṇakāriṇoḥ nāṭakaprakaraṇayoḥ*.
120 Keith, *op. cit*., p. 345
121 See, supra, under fn. 38.
122 V. Raghavan, *The Social Play in Sanskrit*.
123 Both were originally connected with the Dionysian festivals.
124 Eg. *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa*, pp. 287 ff.; *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, 6. 273-312.

—

Chapter 4

Geographical Horizons and Material Culture

Geographical Horizons

The ancient Indian tradition of 'geography' was in fact a mixture of cosmography and geography, of myth, symbol and fact. The *Vedas* speak of a number of worlds, streams and mountains.[1] The Buddhist tradition clearly conceived of a central mountain, *Meru*, and of several stretches of water and mountain ranges around it. Beyond the eight ranges are the continents, four in number. At the same time these mountain ranges are also called Islands (*dvīpas*), which would make their number seven.[2] The Purāṇas also mention the Four Continents around Meru and then again Seven Continents without using the Buddhist terminology though two of the names viz. *Uttarakuru* and *Jambūdvīpa*[3] find mention in the Purāṇas with some difference. When the Purāṇas conceive the world as a lotus, they place the Meru at its pericarp and the four continents around it as its petals. The four continents are Bhadrāśva, Bhārata, Ketumāla and Uttarakuru.[4] Elsewhere the Purāṇas describe the earth as divided into seven *dvīpas*, Jambūdvīpa being the central one. Jambūdvīpa is divided into nine *varṣas* and Bhārata is one of them. Bhārata, again, is divided into nine *dvīpas* and *Kumārīdvīpa* is one of them.[5] It has been argued by Prof. V.S. Agrawala that the Purāṇas had two distinct conceptions of geography viz., *Caturdvīpa* and *Saptadvīpa*. He holds that the latter represents a later conception.[6] The division of Bhārata into nine 'islands' is held to belong to the Gupta age. If this reconstruction if accepted, the different Purāṇic geographical conception could serve as chronological markers in the dating of other texts. Unfortunately the idea that the conception of seven continents is distinctly later than that of the four continents, cannot be said to be well established. Both the conceptions have ancient roots and the admixture of mythical with factual elements makes it impossible to regard the conception of seven continents as simply due to the growth of geographical information. As a result, when we find the geography of seven continents reflected in the *Nāṭya Śāstra* we are only entitled to speak of the general connection of the *NŚ* with the Purāṇic tradition without being more precise.

Dramatic representation may relate to events and characters located anywhere in the vast world. Bharata eleborates a system of dividing the parts of the stage into distinct 'zones' or 'orbits' *(kakṣyās)* for the purpose of facilitating location in different spaces, so to say. In this context he gives in chapter XIII an idea of what was currently believed about the world in his times. When he speaks of *varṣāṇi sapta dvīpāśca*',[7] 'the word *sapta* seems to qualify '*varṣāṇi*' as well as '*dvīpāḥ*' by the *dehalī-dīpaka-nyāya* and it seems to be suggested that the 'continents' *(varsas)* as well as 'islands' *(dvipas)* may be regarded as seven. In a subsequent verse numbered 21 but placed within square brackets by the editor, we find the seven *varṣas* mentioned as *Bhārata*, *Haima*, *Harivarṣa*, *Ilāvṛta*, *Ramya*, *Kiṁpuruṣa* and *Uttarakuru*.[8] Of the *dvīpas* only *Jambūdvīpa* finds explicit mention.[9]

The more realistic part of ancient geography related to the division of India into diverse distinct regions or Janapadas. A number of scholars have examined the lists of Janapadas found in the Epics and the Sūtras, the Purāṇas,the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, Buddhist and Jaina literature, foreign accounts etc.[10] Here, again, we have to reckon with the fact that the whole of India was quite well-known in the epic-Purāṇic literature. The *NŚ*, thus, can only be expected to give more or less well-known and standardized information. The *NŚ* mentions seven great mountains where divine and semi-divine beings dwell.[11] Thus on Kailāśa in the Himālayas dwell the yakṣas and the rākṣasas. They are called Haimavatas. Gandharvas and apsarases dwell on Hemakūṭa. The nāgas dwell on Niśadha, the gods on Mahāmeru, the siddhas on Nīla, the daityas on Śvetaparvata and the pitṛs (manes) on Śṛṅgavān. These mountains are called abodes of divine beings *(divyāvāsas)*. Of these Hemakūṭa and Mahāmeru and possibly Śṛṅgavān appear to be mythical.

Coming to the human world *(loka)* it is held to consist of diverse countries characterized by their distinctive dresses, speech and manners *(nānādeśaveśabhāṣācāraḥ)*.[12] Four basic regions and 'styles' *(pravṛtti)* based on them are recognized. These are Western *(Āvanti)*, Northern *(Pāñcālī)*, Southern *(Dākṣiṇātya)*, and Eastern *(Auḍramāgadhī)*.[13] The Southern region lies between the southern sea and the Vindhyas[14] but it has also been described as consisting of the countries dependent on Mahendra, Malaya, Sahya, Mekala and Pālamañjara.[15] Again, the southern people are enumerated as Kosala, Tosala, Kaliṅga, Yavana, Khasa, Dramiḍa, Āndhra, Mahārāṣtra, Vaiṇṇa and Vanavāsaja.[16] Here Kosala obviously means southern Kosala, as in the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta. A Vākāṭaka inscription mentions Kosala and Mekalā together.[17] An

Aśokan edict mentions Tosālī as the head-quarters of Kaliṅga.[18] Dhauli has been sought to be derived from Tosālī. Several Purāṇas mention Kaliṅga in the Dakṣiṇāpatha though some place it more accurately in the south-east.[19] Abhinavagupta points out that on account of the dual status of Oḍra and Kaliṅga, in the south as well as in the east, they have been attributed two *vṛttis*.[20] The mention of the Yavanas in the south is surprising because they are usually referred to in the north-west. The Khasas too are generally regarded as *Parvatāśrayiṇaḥ* and placed in the north.[21] The fact that Yavanas and Khasas are mentioned together suggests that perhaps the Śakas are intended as they are not mentioned otherwise in this list of janapadas. The rule of the Śaka Satrapas is well-known to have extended to the Dakṣiṇāpatha at one time. This reference thus could have an important bearing on the dating of the *NŚ*. It may also be recalled that Aśoka refers to the Yavana Tuṣāspha in Kathiawar. Perhaps there was some colony of the Yavanas there. Principally, however the Yonas are placed with the Kāmbojas.

The Dramiḍas are apparently the same as the Draviḍas whom some Purāṇas place in the south-west.[22] It may be remembered that the term does not occur in the inscriptions of Aśoka, which nevertheless do refer to the people of the extreme south. But Aśoka fails to refer to the Āndhras whose name occurs as far back as the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, Megasthenes and Manu.[23] Perhaps Dramiḍa and Āndhra were more current in literary rather than administrative contexts.

Mahārāṣṭra as such does not occur in the inscriptions of Aśoka. It has been suggested plausibly that the Rāṣṭrikas of Aśoka were probably the people of Mahārāṣṭra.[24] Although some Purāṇas mention Mahārāṣṭra, it has been suggested that the earliest reference to them comes from *Maṇimekalai* in the fourth century A.D.[25] This may, however, be doubted because some of the Purāṇic references could be earlier. This also disposes of D.C. Sircar's view that the mention of Mahāraṣṭra shows that the *NŚ* could not be earlier than the Gupta age.

The mention of Vaiṇṇa as the name of a people is quite uncommon. Veṇṇa is usually the name of a river. A variant reading is Bhilla but the editor explains Vaiṇṇa as *Kṛṣṇapinākinītīravāsinaḥ*.[26] The variant for Vānavāsaja is Vānavāsaka. Vanavāsī or Vaijayantī was situated in the interior on the banks of the river Varadā and there was a port on the west coast bearing the same name.[27] It was the capital of the Kadambas.

In the west were situated the janapadas of Āvantikas, Vaidiśikas, Saurāṣṭras, Mālavas, Saindhavas, Sauvīras, Ānartas, Arbudeyas,

Daśārṇas, Traipuras and Mārtikāvatas.[28] Avantī was one of the 16 mahājanapadas of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* and is included in the Purāṇic list of janapadas. Ancient Vidiśā has been identified with modern Bhilsa. It was the ancient capital of Daśārṇa and was situated on the river Vetravatī. Mālavas are generally identified with the Malloi mentioned by the Greeks in the Punjab. They have been located in the Doab of the Chenab and Ravi.[29] They appear to have migrated southward later to present-day Malwa. The *Brahma Purāṇa*, thus, locates Avanti in the Mālava janapada.[30] Surāṣṭra is well-known as modern Kathia war and it is mentioned as far back as Pāṇini and the *Arthaśāstra*.[31] Sindhu and Sauvīra are clubbed together in the Purāṇas.[32] Elsewhere they are mentioned separtely. The Sindhudeśa is placed to the west of the Indus by Vātsyāyana.[33] In the *Dīgha Nikāya* Roruka is mentioned as the capital of Sauvīra.[34] Roruka is identified with modern Rohri. Dvāravatī was mentioned as the capital of Ānarta. The Ārbudeyakas should obviously be located near Mount Abu. Daśārṇa was the river Dhasan and its surrounding territory. Tripura has been identified with Tawar in Jabalpur. It became the capital of the Kalacuris in later times.[35] Mārtikāvata janapada has also been located around Mount Abu.[36]

The eastern janapadas mentioned are Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Vatsa, Oḍra and Magadha. Pauṇḍra, Nepālaka, Antargiri and Bahirgiri, Plavaṅgama, Malada, Mallavartaka, 'Brahmottara etc.,' Bhārgava, Mārgava, Prāgjyotiṣa, Pulinda, Vaideha, Tāmraliptaka, Prāṅga, Prāvṛtis and "the other countries mentioned in the Purāṇas."[37]

Aṅga with its capital Campā is well-known from ancient Buddhist, Jaina and epic literature. It was one of the sixteen mahājanapadas of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*. The Jaina *Bhagavatī Sūtra* mentions Vaṅga by the side of Aṅga.[38] Kālidāsa mentions the Vaṅgas with their naval forces.[39] From the Gupta period onwards the Vaṅgas gained historical importance. Kaliṅga does not find place either in the *Aṅguttara* list or in the *Bhagavatī* list but its importance in the Nanda, Maurya and later periods is well-known from epigraphs. While Oḍra and Magadha vere undoubtedly parts of the east, it is curious to find Vatsa mentioned in the east. Pauṇḍra obviously refers to the later Puṇḍravardhana *bhukti*. Nepāla, Antargiri and Bahirgiri were Himalayan and submontane regions.[40] Their being placed in the east is a curiosity. While the Plavaṅgas are unknown, the Maladas have been placed to the south of the confluence of Gaṅgā and Jamunā.[41] While Mallas and Maladas are known, Mallavartaka appears new. Brahmottara is mentioned in the Purāṇas as one of the janapadas near the Gaṅgā.[42] Bhārgava as a region is not

known, though Mārgava finds mention. Prāgjyotiṣa finds mention in the *Mahābhārata*.[43] Pulindas have been located in different parts of the country in different texts, including the east. Videha and Tāmralipti are well-known but Prāṅga and Pravṛti are not known at all. The clear reference to the Purāṇas—*Ye Purāṇe samprakīrtitaḥ* is here illuminating but the change from janapada to deśa is interesting.[44] The northern or central region includes Pañcāla, Śaurasena, Kaśmīra, Hastināpura, Bāhlīka, Śākala, Madraka and Auśīnara, and the regions to the north of the Gaṅgā and upto the Himālayas.[45] Abhinavagupta, belonging to a later date, notes the absence of Turuṣka, Āraṭṭaka, Daradaka, Khasa etc.[46]

Pañcāla was an ancient janapada of epic fame. The northern Pañcāla has been located between the Gaṅgā and the Gomatī and had its capital at Ahicchatrā.[47] The southern Pañcāla was between the Gaṅgā and the Chambal and its capital was at Kāmpilya.[48] Śūrasena was one of the sixteen mahājanapadas and the Jaina texts make Mathurā its capital. Mathurā was reckoned among the three chief cities of India.[49] Some later texts, however, distinguish between the Śurasenas and the Māthurakas. Although Aśoka does not mention Kaśmīra, the Ceylonese chronicles mention a Buddhist mission to that country in the times of Aśoka.[50] Kalhaṇa includes Kaśmīra in the Mauryan empire.[51] Hastināpura was the ancient capital of the Kuru kingdom. It was founded by Hastin and was on the bank of the Gaṅgā. The identification of Bāhlika has been a matter of controversy. Some scholars have identified it with Bactria or Balkh; others with a region in Punjab. It has been suggested that perhaps the migration of some Bāhlika tribals to Punjab may explain the duality of references.[52] The country of the Madras has been placed between the Chenab and the Jhelum and Śākala is generally held to have been its capital. The separate mention of Śākala and Madraka is, therefore, a curiosity. Uśīnara has been coupled with Vaśa in later Vedic literature and placed in the central or northern region.[53] It has been suggested that Vaśa and Vatsa are the same, the latter being the janapada of which Kauśāmbī was the capital; but Vatsa has already been included in the *NŚ* list of the eastern deśas.

In describing its janapadas the division of India into certain broad regions, four or more, was a common practice in the Bhuvana Kośa section of the Purāṇas as also in other texts dealing with geography such as the *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*. The basis of this division has not been spelt out in these texts. In the *NŚ*, on the other hand, we find a clear *raison d'etre* of the four-fold division. This is in terms of *pravṛttis* or

regional styles and *vṛttis* or dramatic styles, the two being so close as to be indistinguishable in practical content. It may be recalled that the *pravṛttis* are four, viz.

Āvanti dākṣiṇātya ca tāthā caivoḍra-māgadhī|
Pañcālamadhyama caiva vijñeyāstu pravṛttayaḥ||

(*NŚ*, VI. 25). Their connection with the well-known *vṛttis* as described in *NŚ*, chapter XX, is explained in *NŚ* chapter XIII. Two questions are explicitly raised[54] viz. : There are many countries in the 'world'; how, then, can there be a four-fold division of the *vṛttis* ? Besides, the employment of the *vṛttis* has common features, so why divide them into four ? The point is that different countries of the world are distinguished by different modes of life. They differ in their dress, artefacts, language, conduct, secular and religious, or common and learned, mode of livelihood etc., and this distinctive way of life is called *vṛtti*. When it is made known to others, it is called *pravṛtti*.[55] On what basis are these life styles to be classified into four ? In particular, since the *vṛttis* have common features and help in aesthetic generalization through revealing universal psychic factors of love, anger, infatuation etc. and thus supersede the reference to particularities of place etc.,[56] why bring in such coordinates now ?

The answer given is that the differences of regions are generally admitted and may be connected with broad psychic attitudes. Thus the four dramatic modes or *vṛttis* may serve to represent regional styles. The southerners are, thus, particularly fond of song and dance and of clever, delicate and graceful gestures of the limbs. They have an abundance of romance (*śṛṅgāra)*. Such a style is called *Kaiśikī*.[57] It may be recalled that *Kaiśikī* is the peculiar element of grace which is characteristic of the fine arts. In the west, the *vṛtti* is designated *Āvantī* but on account of the predominance of dharma, it is also regarded as *Sāttvatī*. *Kaiśikī* too may be admixed.[58] The eastern is *Oḍra-māgadhī* and is an admixture of *Bhāratī* and *Ārabhaṭī*. It is marked by a bombastic use of words.[59] The northern or *Pāñcālī* mixes *Sāttvatī* and *Ārabhaṭī*. It has only a little of song and dance but displays movements of force and violence.[60]

Since the dramatic styles could be mixed freely according to context,[61] it is clear that they cannot really be considered as realistic or representatives of regional styles. They can only be regarded as idealized and conventional.

Material Culture

Food and Drink

The preparation of food and drink was held to have a vital as well as a spiritual significance in the Vedic age. Thus soma was

divinized and *anna* was declared to be Brahman—*Annam brahmeti* (*Tai. Upa.*, 3.2). Food was held to determine the quality of the mind (*Ch. Upa.*, 7.26.2). While prescriptions for mendicants took note of the spiritual relevance of different types of food and drink, medical treatises discussed their effects on health. At the same time the development of city life, mercantile wealth and the royal court led to the development of culinary arts. The *Kāmasūtras* (1.3.15) of Vātsyāyana detailing the mode of life of the affluent town-dweller (*nāgaraka*) mention the sixty-four arts and among them include *vicitraśākayuṣa-bhakṣya-vikarakriya* and *pānaka-rasa-ragasava-yojanam*. In commenting on these, Yaśodhara explains that food is of four kinds viz., *bhakṣya*, *bhojya*, *lehya* and *peya*. The first of these or *bhakṣya* has to be suitably treated with *vyañjanas*, which is a matter of art. The chief *vyañjana* is vegetable or *śāka*. *Śāka* is of ten *kinds—mūla-patra-karīrāgra-phala-kānda-prarūḍhakam| tvakpuṣpam kaṇṭakam ceti śākam daśavidhaṁ smṛtam*. *Peya* or drink was of two kinds—boiled or otherwise. The former is called soup or *yūṣa*, *bhojya* includes sweets (*khaṇḍa-khādya*) etc. Unboiled drinks are also of two kinds, fermented and unfermented. *Lehya* could be a powder or liquid, tasting salty, sour and bitter and a little sweet. In the absence of really ancient texts on cookery, it is difficult to get a full picture of the culinary arts in classical times but there can be no doubt that these were recognized as important. In a famous story of the *Daśakumāracarita* (2.6), Daṇḍin narrates how a young girl wins the heart of a suitor through her expertise in the preparation of food and drink. What she prepared and served was simple enough viz., rice with pulses, *ghee*, curd, vegetable and some appetizers, but she did it with great taste and skill. In Somadeva's *Yaśastilaka* we find a striking contrast between the food of the rich and that of the poor. Śrīharṣa's *Naiṣadhīya* makes it clear that meat-eating was quite common at least among the princes.

Evidence from the NŚ

The *NŚ* mentions *bhojya*, *bhakṣya* and *pāna* as the ingredients out of which offerings (*bali*) were to be constituted during *raṅgapujā*.[62] Since '*yadannaḥ puruśo loke tadannā tasya devatā*,' it follows that these were the three main types of food and drink current in the age of the author. Abhinava explains[63] that *bhojya* is an eatable which contains clearly distinct parts of solid particles (*khara viśadam*). Examples are bread (*śaṣkulī*) and solid round sweets now called *laḍḍūs* (*modakas*). This is clearly the chewable (*carvya*) kind of food. While *modakas* were ancient it may be noted that *śaṣkulīs* are not directly mentioned in the text of Bharata.[64] The more ancient *apūpa* is not

mentioned here. It is mentioned, however, in the offering for Yama and Mitra and for Kuvera and his followers in the *NŚ*.[65] *Bhakṣya* is illustrated by *pāyasa (khīr* in Hindi) and *kṛśarā (khicrī* in Hindi).[66] Apparently it is the *lehya* variety of food. *Pāna* or drink is illustrated by milk and juices of sugarcane, grapes etc. Since the occasion is ritualistic no reference is made to any intoxicating drinks. They are mentioned in the *NŚ*, however, in the context of the offerings made to bhūtasaṅghas and dānavas.[67]

Certain types of food were specially noted for their colours. Thus white food (*śuklānna*) meant *pāyasa* (*khīr*), dark food (*nīlānna*) meant *kṛśarā (khicrī*), yellow food *(pīta)* meant rice with clarified butter *(ghṛtaudana)*, and red food *(rakta)* meant rice with *guḍa (guḍaudana)*.[68] Again, different types of food were offered to different castes. Brāhmaṇas were offered *ghee* and *khīr (ghṛtapāyasaḥ)* and Kṣattriyas were offered *madhuparka*, the traditional offering for honoured guests. Craftsmen *(kartṛs)* were given *guḍaudana* (rice with *guḍa*).[69] Again, the Brāhmaṇas were to be given *sarpiṣ* (clarified butter) and *pāyasa* (*khīr*). The Kṣattriyas were to be given red food as mentioned above. The Vaiśyas were to be given yellow food and Śūdras dark food. The most valued food was apparently *madhupāyasa (khīr* with honey) which was to be offered to the chief priest and the ruler. Among the gods, Brahmā was offered *madhuparka*, Sarasvatī *pāyasa*, Śiva, Viṣṇu, Indra etc. *modakas*, Agni *ghṛtaudana*, Soma and Arka *guḍaudana*, Viśvedevāḥ, gandharvas and munis *madhupāyasa*, Yama and Mitra *apūpas* and *modakas*, pitṛs, piśācas' and nāgas *sarpiḥkṣīra*.[70]

Among the grains yava and śālitaṇḍula find explicit mention,[71] which has no negative significance since such mention is incidental to ritual requirements. Non-vegetarian food was offered to bhūtasaṅghas, rākṣasas and dānavas. Fish was offered to Varuṇa. Liquor was often served alongwith meat.[72] Meat juice was supposed to be invigorating and given as part of military training and exercise.[73]

These references to food and drink in the *NŚ* are undoubtedly scanty and, what is more, they are in a ritual context, which means that they depend on a tradition coming down from ancient times. But then there is hardly any reason to suppose that food habits in the age of the *NŚ* differed radically from those reflected in the *Arthaśāstra*, *Kāmaśāstra*, and the early *Smṛtis*. Regional differences were probably more significant. By the later Vedic age rice, barley, wheat, meat and milk products constituted the staple diet.[74] The *Arthaśāstra*, specially relevant for eastern India, specifies the standard food for men of the upper or lower strata of society *(āryāḥ, avarāḥ)*. For the former rice with both oil or *ghee*, each equal to the fourth part of rice, and salt equal

to the sixteenth part of *sūpa* is prescribed. For the latter, the *avaras*, the quantity of *sūpa* was to be only one-sixth while oil was to be half.[75] In some *Jātakas* (e.g., *Mahāumagga)* we hear of barley gruel *(yavabhattam)* instead of rice and the *NŚ* mentions *yavāgū*. Although diverse preparations of rice and milk products dominate the scene in the *NŚ*, the use of barley and grain find mention and that of wheat pulses may be presumed. Rice was prepared with pulses, *ghee*, sugar-candy *(guḍa)*, honey or milk. Meat and rice were cooked together also from ancient times although no specific reference is found in the *NŚ*. Cereal preparations included gruel, cakes *(apūpa)*, preparation of flour *(piṣṭabhakṣya)*[76] and sweets *(modaka)*. Drinks and juices with variegated tastes and flavours were held in high esteem.[77] These involved the use of substances *(dravya)* like *guḍa* etc., condiments *(vyañjanas)* with bitter, sweet, sour taste etc., and plant products like tamarind, wheat fragments, turmeric etc.[78]

The general picture of food and drink in the *NŚ* is comparable to that in the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti*, which mentions *kṛśarā, samvāva, pāyasa, apūpa* and *śaṣkulī*'.[79] *Samvāva* is explained by the *Mitākṣarā* as "*kṣīra-guḍa-ghṛtādikṛtaḥ utkarikākhyāḥ*." Now *utkarika* is also mentioned in the *NŚ* though it is printed as *utkarikā*.[80] From Manu and Yājñavalkya it is also clear that meat-eating was now looked upon with disfavour although it was current.[81]

Settlements, Dwellings and Furniture

The contrast of town and country was quite clearly perceived in classical times as may be gathered from the works of the Sātavāhana-Kuṣāṇa and Gupta-Vākāṭaka ages. Vātsyāyana describes the house, furnishings, habits, tastes and manners of the sophisticated town-dweller *(nāgaraka)* at length and declares that the sophisticated man from the country or village should study and imitate the town-dweller *(grāmavāsica-nāgarakajanasya vṛttain varṇayan śraddhām ca janayan tadevānukurvīta)*.[82] He mentions four kinds of urban settlements viz., *nagara, paṭṭana, kharvaṭa* and *mahat*. Yaśodhara explains that the first of these was a judicial centre situated within an area of eight hundred villages. *Paṭṭaṇa* was the capital town. *Kharvaṭa* was the chief settlement within two hundred villages. *Mahat* or *droṇamukha* was the chief of four hundred villages.[83] These terms are comparable to those used in the *Arthaśāstra*[84]

If, as is generally believed, the lost *Bṛhatkathā* and the *gāthās* of Hāla belong to the Sātavāhana age, we may see in them the contrasting images of town and country respectively. The *Mṛcchakaṭika* of Śūdraka and the *Padmaprābhṛtaka* have also been placed in the same age[85] and attest to the high development of town-life. In the *Śākun-*

tala of Kālidāsa Śārṅgarava condemns city-life as full of confusion and bustle as if on fire.[86] The *Amarakośa*, generally placed in the Gupta age, has a distinct *Puravarga* or section relating to the city. It begins with the name of the city and after detailing some of its parts and features ends with a reference to village, hamlet and tribal settlements.

The *Nāṭyaśāstra* distinguishes between the populace of the country and the town but it does not establish any formal connection between the town and the theatre.[87] The reason obviously is that even though patronized by the rulers and wealthy merchants living in cities, the theatre never lost its connection with the folk at large and their festivals, mimes, and dances, nor with religious cults and the temple. Open air theatre was known and the stage properties used were relatively simple.[88] The technical professionalism of the theatre was really exercised in the regulation of the histrionics etc., which accompanied it, apart from the basic literary art of drama itself. In other words, the ancient theatre by its nature was not essentially tied down to any elaborate building and sets, and thus to city life. Nevertheless, the developed professionalism of the actors, playwrights and musicians did imply an increasing dependence on distinct class of patrons which was formed by wealthy princes, ministers and merchants. Most of the forms of the drama catered as spectacles relating to the life of these classes. The theatrical architecture described in the *NŚ* certainly indicates a location in the city. The representation of cities is common enough within many of plays themselves. For example, the *Mṛcchakaṭika* represents the city vividly. It is the *uparūpakas* which were plainly connected with folk life[89] but the *NŚ* disregards them. Vātsyāyana mentions the presentation of dramatic spectacle *(prekṣaṇakas)* on the occasion of public festivals and entertainments in the cities.[90] The troupes of actors who presented such spectacles could be either regularly hired ones or visiting troupes from outsides the city.

House building was specialized and ritualized art.[91] The building plot was required to be ploughed, cleared and ritually purified before it was measured in accordance with the building plan. The laying of foundations, the construction of walls, roofs, pillars and openings was followed by brick work, wood work, plaster work and decoration. The elements connected with the pillars were *ūha* and *pratyūha*, *sañjavana*, *śālabhañjikā*, *niryūha* and *kuhara*.[92] Two varieties of lattice windows are mentioned—*jāla* and *gavākṣa*. Several types of floors are mentioned. Paintings adorned well-plastered and polished wall-surfaces. Men and women, creepers and dancing groups

etc., were pictured in these. Personal experiences *(caritam cātmabhogajam)* were also the theme of these paintings.[93] In the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti we can find an example of this.[94] Such ornate and elaborate buildings, however, belonged only to the rich or were for public use. The poor must have lived as ever in houses of mud and thatch. The *Atharvaveda* itself describes the construction of such huts.

For illumination the house depended on oil lamps, *dīpikā*, and torches of inflammable material *(ulkā)*.[95] On the furniture of the houses the *NŚ* gives detailed information about the different types of seats which were used for different classes of persons.[96] Thus for the crown-prince and commander-in-chief *muṇḍāsana* was prescribed. For the ruling queens *siṁhāsana* and for the princes in general *kuthāsana* which apparently refers to a rug-seat. A cane-seat or *vetrāsana* was prescribed for the wives of the royal priest and ministers. *AB* says that some regard *vetrāsana* to refer to a blanket seat.[97] For the mistresses of the king seats of cloth or leather were prescribed. For Brāhmaṇa women and women ascetics. *paṭṭāsana* was prescribed. For public women *masūraka* or a kind of pillow is mentioned. For other women the ground itself served as the seat. Buddhist monks or ancient seers sat on *brusī*.

Dress and Ornaments

While the *NŚ* gives details about hair styles and ornaments, it does not detail the dresses but only requires that they should be appropriate to the type, region and age of the character concerned—*bhūṣaṇaiścāpi veśaiśca nānāvasthāsamāśraiḥ* (*NŚ*, 21.53); also *adeśayukto veśohi na śobhāṁ janayiṣyati* (*ibid.*, 21. 73). In the colder regions of the north and the north-west the use of upper garments, fuller coverings, woolen material and sewn clothes was commoner. The 'northern dress' or '*udīcya veśa*' is an example.[98] Expensive cloth and ornaments characterised the upper classes. Generally, the dress consisted of three parts viz., a piece of cloth (*vāsas*) to cover the lower body, a covering for the upper part *(uttarīya)* often as a wrap, and a head-dress. Under-clothing was also used, though not habitually by women.[99] In the Vedic age we hear of *vāsas*, *adhivāsas* and the *usṇīśa* as the three main parts of the dress.[100] *Nīvī* was some kind of under-garment, *rasanā* a girdle, *drāpi* and *atka* probably sewn clothes fitting the body.[101] Shoes and sandals are clearly referred to in later Vedic literature.[102] The use of wool and leather was common.

The Buddhist monks were allowed three robes or *cīvaras* viz., *saṅghāṭī*, *uttarāsaṅga* and *antaravāsaka*.[103] The nuns were, however, also permitted a robe for bath *(udakasatika)* and a bodice *(saṅkacchikam)*.

The robes were generally stiched out of smaller pieces of cloth patterned like the 'fields of Magadha', and dyed. Sandals *(upohana)* of one lining *(ekapalāsikā)* were permitted in the Majjhimadeśa, outside which they could have more than one lining. From prohibitions we know of numerous kinds of ornamental shoes and sandals current among the laity.

The *Arthaśāstra* gives detailed information about the materials, manufacture and types of clothing.[104] *Vārabāṇa* has been interpreted as a type of woolen coat and *sampuṭika* as trousers of a king.[105] The *Arthaśāstra* also evinces a brisk trade in cloth with Central Asia which must have been fairly ancient. In the period of the *NŚ* the invasions from the north-west must have given added weight to such trade. From this very period we begin to get the the plastic representation of dress and ornaments and attempts have been made to connect these with the literary descriptions. This has also raised much controversy about the extent to which clothes were used to cover the upper part of the body or the use of sewn clothes.

Charles Fabri has argued that the dresses shown in art must be regarded as representing those actually worn by the people and hence that "Indian women of all classes went about bare from the waist upwards (as do the Balinese) for many hundreds of years." "Anyone with eyes can see that in the whole history of Indian art, from the earliest times to approximately the 12th century A.D., women are invariably shown (with the sole exception of foreign fashions at one period) as wearing no garments to cover their breasts."[106] The argument that this may be only an artistic convention does not hold good at all. On the other hand, literary evidence is to be treated with caution because the meaning of words changes. Thus the *sārī* which Draupadī wore and which Duḥśāsana sought to snatch was probably only a small piece of cloth called '*sārī*' wrapped round her waist only, and no upper garment.[107] Where women appear with upper garments they are to be regarded as foreigners or as sporting a fashion of foreign origin.

This view overstates the fact that all women in ancient India did not habitually put on sewn bodices. The upper part of the body was generally covered by a portion of the *sārī* or by a wrap. This was commoner in Central and Southern India. However, despite the artists' preference for revealing and modelling the breasts, there is enough evidence to show that the covering of the breasts was habitual. The *Amarkośa* describes bodices as *cola* and *kūrpāsaka*.[108] The Buddhist monastic dress makes definite provisions for the covering of the upper part of the body especially of women; Kālidāsa describes Śakuntalā as having her breasts tightly covered by *valkala*, [109] and refers to the

breast cloth *(stanāṁśuka)* of Urvaśī.[110] Bāṇa describes the women of Sthāṇvīśvara as *abhujaṅgagamyaḥ kañcukīnyśca*. The commentator explains *kañcukam strīṇām vāsaḥ vārabāṇākhyaḥ*.[111]

Fabri's reference to Draupadī, in fact, conclusively disproves his theory because he has apparently argued without looking at the text. Draupadī is described as *Ekavastrā adhonīvī rodamānā rajasvalā*.[112] That is, that she had only one cloth was due to her being *rajasvalā*. She says *adya rajasvalāsmi ekam ca vāso mama*.[113] It implies that having one cloth was not habitual but exceptional.[114] Even so the upper part of the body was not left bare except when part of the *sārī* fell down owing to the snatching by Duḥśāsana—*Prakīrṇakeśī patitārdhavastrā Duḥśāsanena vyavadhūyamānā*. She is described as *srastottarīyam*, which shows that part of the *sārī* was used to cover the upper part of the body and could then be described as *uttarīya*.[115]

As mentioned before, the *NŚ* takes the dresses for granted, but describes the ornaments in detail. They are said to be of four kinds—*āvedhya* which require piercing, *bandhanīya* which have to be tied, *kṣepya* which are worn around and *āropya* which are simply put on.[116] *Kuṇḍala* or ear-ring is an example of *āvedhya*. Pearl-bands, arm clasps *(aṅgada)* and waist band *(śroṇisūtra)* are examples of *bandhanīya*. Anklets *(nūpura)* illustrate the *kṣepya* and gold strings and necklace are *āropya*.[117] The ornaments for men, whether kings or gods, are thus described[118]—*cūḍāmaṇi* (crest jewel) and *mukuṭa* (tiara) for the head, *kuṇḍala* (ear-ring), *mocaka*[119] and *kīla*[120] for the ears, *muktāvalī* (pearl string), *harṣaka*[121] and *sūtraka* (band) for the neck, *vetikā* and *aṅguli-mudrā*[122] for the fingers, *valaya* (bangle), *rucaka* and *cūlikā*[123] were used on the wrist and forearm, *keyūra* and above that *aṅgada* were used on the upper arm, *trisara* (three strands of pearls) and *hāra* on the breast, pendant garlands and strings on limbs, *talaka* and *sūtra-ka*[124] on the waist. Women used a larger variety of ornaments. For the head they used *śikhāpāśa*, *śikhāvyāla*, *piṇḍīpattra*, *cūḍāmaṇi*, *ma-karikā*, *muktājāla*, *gavākṣikā* and *śirṣajālaka*.[125] *Kaṇḍaka* and *śikhi-patra*,[126] *veṇīpuccha* and *lalāṭatilaka* were used for the forehead. For the ears there was a great variety of ornaments—*karṇikā*, *karṇavalaya*, *pattrakarṇikā*, *kuṇḍala*,[127] *karṇamudrā*, *karṇotkilakā*, *dantapatra*[1-8] and *karṇapūra*. On the cheeks *tilaka* and *patralekha* was used. For the neck are mentioned *muktāvalī* and *vyālapaṁkti*, *mañjarī*, *ratnamālikā*, *ratnā-valī*, *sūtraka*, *dvisara*, *trisara catuḥsārika* and *sṛṅkhalikā*. *Aṅgada* and *valaya* were used on the upper arm. Diverse necklaces and pearl nett-ing *(maṇi jāla)* for covering the breasts are mentioned. For the arms *kalāpī*, *kaṭaka*, *śaṅkha*, *hastapatra* and *pūraka* are listed, while *mudrā* and *aṅgulīyaka* adorned the fingers. On the waist were worn *mekhalā*,

kañcikā, *rasanā* and *kalāpa*. *Kāñcī* was of one string, *mekhalā* of eight strings, *rasanā* of sixteen strings, *kalāpa* of twenty-five, sixty-four or hundred and eighty strands. On ankles *nūpura kiṅkiṇikā*, *ghaṇṭikā*, *ratnajālaka* and *kaṭaka* were used.

A great deal of emphasis was laid on the hair styles which were distinctive of different classes of female characters. The hair could be tied in a top-knot with pearl braids or tied in a single plait, or part of the hair could be tied in a knot encircled by a net and the rest allowed to descend in a braid. Ābhīra women tied their hair into two plaits. The women of Avanti had curled forelocks, those of Gauḍa had forelocks with a top bun and a hanging braid. North-western women wore a high top knot. The women of the South wore their hair in the style called *ullekhya* in which the hair was tied in the *kumbhī* knot and curls on the forehead.

The kind of material culture reflected in the *NŚ* is distinguished by its aesthetic taste rather than by much affluence or poverty. It certainly presupposes an economic order in which agriculture flourished and handicrafts included not only useful but ornamental industries. As is known from other sources the handicrafts were organised in a highly professional and socially influential guilds. Trade and transport covered the whole country and went to other lands. In the *NŚ*, the traders along with the princes, priests and ministers form the leading class. The hierarchical social order and the growth of industry, trade and taxes clearly show an ample surplus over and above the immediate needs.

However the *NŚ* does not shed any light on economic organisation except negatively in as much as while it speaks of *mahāmātras*, it does not mention any feudal lords. Its picture is nearer to that of the epics and *Sūtras*. What it recaptures for us is the structure of taste and beauty in the rituals, conventions and styles which the people effected in their social life and feminine graces which lent it charm.

Footnotes

1 *Vedic Index*, II, p. 424; G.C. Pande, *An Approach to Indian Culture and Civilisation*, pp. 101ff.

2 *Abhidharmakośa*, 3rd *Kośasthāna*; G.C. Pande, *op. cit.*, pp. 111ff.

3 M.R. Singh, *Geographical Data in the Early Purāṇas*, Chap. I; V.S. Agrawala, *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa—ek Sāṁskṛtika Adhyayana*; *Matsya Purāṇa—a Study*.

4 *Mahādvīpāstu vikhyātāḥ cattvāraḥ pattrasaṁsthitāḥ/*
tataḥ karṇikāsaṁsthāno Merurnāma mahābalaḥ//
—*Vāyu Purāṇa*, 1. 34. 46; *Ibid.*, 1. 41.84-85. *Mārkaṇḍeya*, 52. 20-21

and *Matsya*, 113. 43-44 give the names of the four continents.

5 E.g., *Mārkaṇḍeya*, 51.5. 7; *Vāyu*, 1.34. 9-34; V.S. Agrawala, *Matsya Purāṇa*, p. 184. For an attempt at a scientific interpretation of the *Dvīpas*, see S.M. Ali, *The Geography of the Purāṇas*, New Delhi, 1966.

6 V.S. Agrawala, *l.c.*

7 *NŚ*, XIII. 5.

8 *Ibid.*, VIII. 21.

9 *Ibid.*, XIII. 33.

10 S.B. Chaudhuri, *Ethnic Settlements in Ancient India*, 1955; Schaefer, *Ethnography of Ancient India* (Wiesbaden); Motichandra, *Geographical and Economic Studies in the Mahābhārata, Upāyanaparvan*, 1945; Cunningham, *Ancient Geography of India;* B.C. Law, *Historical Geography of Ancient India*, 1954; D.C. Sircar, *Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India*; V.S. Agrawala, *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*; *Matsya Purāṇa*; M.R. Singh, *Geographical Data in the Early Purāṇas.*

11 *NŚ*, XIII. 28-32.

12 *NŚ*, Vol. II., p. 206 (prose text after verse 37 of Chapter XIII).

13 Cf. *Abhinavabhārati*, *NŚ*, Vol. II, p. 207—*loko hi daksiṇāpathaḥ pūrvadeśaḥ paścimadeśaḥ uttarabhūmiriti caturdhā vibhāgosti.*

14 *NŚ*, XIII. 41.

15 *Ibid.*, XIII. 30. Of the names here Palamañjara is not known elsewhere.

16 *Ibid.*, XIII. 40.

17 Balaghat Inscription, EI, IX, p. 267.

18 Cf. D.R. Bhandarkar, *Aśoka*, pp. 46-47.

19 M.R. Singh, *op. cit.*, p. 227.

20 *AB*, II, p. 210.

21 M.R. Singh, *op. cit.*, p. 366.

22 *Mārkaṇḍeya*, 58. 30-32.

23 *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VII. 18; McCrindle, *Ancient India* (cf. R.C. Majumdar), pp. 140-41; *Manu*, X. 48.

24 R.G. Bhandarkar, *Early History of the Deccan*, p. 20.

25 M.R. Singh, *op. cit.*, p. 274.

26 *NŚ*, Vol. II, p. 208 to 5da.

27 Raychaudhuri, quoted, M.R. Singh, *op. cit.*, p. 277.

28 *NŚ*, XIII. 42-43.

29 McCrindle, *Invasion of India*, p. 357.

30 *Brahma Purāṇa*, 41. 28.

31 *Arthaśāstra*, 11. 4.

32 M.R. Singh, *op. cit.*, pp. 149ff.

33 *Kāmasūtras*, 2.5.25.
34 *Dīgha*, Vol. II, p. 235 (P.T.S. ed.).
35 M.R. Singh, *op. cit.*, p. 346.
36 Pargiter, *Anct. Ind. Hist. Trad.*, p. 279.
37 *NŚ*, XIII. 45-48.
38 J.C. Jain, *Life in Ancient India as Depicted in the Jaina Canons*, p. 250.
39 *Raghuvaṁśa*, 4. 36.
40 Cf. G.C. Pande, *Foundations*, Vol. II, p. 12.
41 Cf. *Rāmāyaṇa*, 1. 24. 12-18.
42 M.R. Singh, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
43 *Mahābhārata*, quoted in S.B. Chaudhari, *Ethnic Settlements in Ancient India*, p. 170.
44 *NŚ*, XIII. 48.
45 *Ibid.*, XIII. 49-50.
46 *AB*, Vol. II, pp. 209-10.
47 Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, p. 22.
48 Cf. *Mahābhārata*, 1.137. 73-74.
49 Cf. *Milindapañho*, (P.T.S. ed), p. 331.
50 Cf. B.C. Law, *Historical Geography of Ancient India*, p. 97.
51 *Rājataraṅgiṇī*, 1. 101ff.
52 M.R. Singh, *op. cit.*, pp. 123-27 fully discusses the problem.
53 *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, VIII. 14.
54 *NŚ*, XIII, prose after verse 37—"*Yathā pṛthivyām nānādeśāḥ santi katham asmin caturvidhatvam upapannam samānalakṣaṇāśca pravṛttayaḥ.*"
55 *Ibid.*, *l.c.* "*Pṛthivyām nānādeśaveṣabhāṣācāra vārtāḥ khyāpayatīti vṛttiḥ pravṛttiśca nivedane.*" *AB* on this (*NŚ*, II, p. 205)—*Deśe deśe yeṣveva veṣādayo naipathyam bhāṣā vā ācāro lokaśāstravyavahāraḥ vārtā kṛṣipāśupālyādijīvikā ceti tān prakhyāpayanti pṛthivyādisarvaloka-vidyāprasiddhiṁ karoti pravṛttirbāhyārthe yasmān nivedane niśśeṣena vedane jñāne pravṛttiśabdaḥ.*
56 *AB*, Vol. II, p. 206—*Tathā ca lobhakrodhamohaistu sadhāraṇīkṛtajagaccintādyāsu pradeśaḥ parākriyate tathā prakṛtepi.*
57 *NŚ*, Vol. II, p. 207—*Tatra dakṣiṇātyāstāvad bahunṛttagītavādyāḥ kaiśikīprāyāḥ caturamadhura-lalitāṅgābhinayāśca.* *AB* on this—*Dākṣiṇātyeṣu śṛṅgārapracuratayā kaiśikyāḥ sambhavaḥ.*
58 *NŚ*, XIII. 43-44; *AB*, Vol. II, p. 207.
59 *AB*, *l.c.* "*Prācyām ghaṭātopavākyāḍambaraprādhanyo bhāratyārabhaṭīyogaḥ.*"
60 *NŚ*, XIII. 51.
61 *Ibid.*, 55-57.

62 *NŚ*, I. 121; *Ibid.*, III. 44-46.
63 *AB*, Vol. I, p. 45.
64 *Śaṣkulī* is, however, mentioned in *Yājñavalkya Smṛti*, 1.7.173. The *Mitākṣarā* explains "*śaṣkulī snehapakvagodhūmavikāraḥ* (ad *Yājña*, *l.c.*)
65 *NŚ*, III. 39. 45. *Mitākṣarā* explains *apūpa* in the same terms as *śaṣkulī* quoted above.
66 *NŚ*, II. 41. 59; *Ibid.*, III. 38; *Ibid.*, II. 60. *Mitākṣarā* explains *kṛśarā* as *tilamudgasiddha odanaḥ* and *pāyasa* as *payasā śṛtam annam (l.c.)*.
67 *NŚ*, III. 40. 42.
68 *Ibid.*, II. 39-40.
69 *Ibid.*, II. 41-42.
70 *Ibid.*, III. 37-45.
71 *Ibid.*, III. 20.
72 *Ibid.*, III. 37-45.
73 *Ibid.*, X. 100; *AB*, II. p. 116—*rasakam iti māṁsarasam seveteti sambandhaḥ*.
74 Vide *Vedic Index*, passim.
75 *Arthaśāstra*, 2.15.43-46—*Taṇḍulānām prasthaḥ caturbhāgaḥ sūpaḥ sūpaśoḍaṣo lavaṇasyāṁśaḥ caturbhāgaḥ sarpiṣastailasya vā ekam āryabhaktaṁ ṣaḍbhāgaḥ sūpaḥ ardhasnehamavarāṇām pādonam strīṇām arham bālānām.*
76 *NŚ*, X. 97; *AB*, II, p. 116—*Yavagūryavānnam.*
77 *NŚ*, III. 43.
78 *Ibid.*, VI, prose on pp. 287-88 (Vol. I) and Abhinava on it.
79 *Yājñavalkya*, 1.7.173.
80 *NŚ*, III. 42.
81 *Yājñavalkya*, 1.7.179-81; *Manu*, 5.48-56.
82 Vātsyāyna, *Kāmasūtras*, 1.4.
83 *Ibid.*, *l.c.*
84 Cf. *Arthaśāstra*, 2.1.4.
85 Cf. V.V. Mirashi, *Sātavāhanon aur Paścimī Kṣatrapon kā Itihāsa evaṁ Abhilekha*, Chap. VI; Cf. Warder, *Indian Kāvya Literature*, Vol. II, pp. 165, 285.
86 *Śākuntala*, Act V.
87 *NŚ* 3.94.
88 *NŚ*, 13. 65-68.
89 Cf. V. Raghavan, *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*.
90 *Kāmasūtras*, 1.4.16.
91 Vide Chap. on Ancient Indian Theatre.
92 *NŚ*, 2.75-78.

93 *Ibid.*, 2.85.
94 *Uttararāmacarita*, Act I.
95 *NŚ*, 3.83, 3.90.
96 *Ibid.*, 12.216ff.
97 *AB*, II. p. 172.
98 Cf. *Udicyaveṣam uttarāpathaveṣam kuryāt udagveṣam ityarthaḥ.* Bhaṭṭotpala on *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, quoted Dr. L.P. Pandey, *Sun Worship in Ancient India*, p. 180.
99 Cf. *Amarakośa*, 2.6.115-19.
100 Vide *Vedic Index*, passim.
101 Moti Chandra, *Bhāratīya Veśa Bhūṣā*, p. 19.
102 E.g. *Tai. Saṁ*, 5.4.4.4; *AV*, 20. 133. 4.
103 Vide Dr. Upasaka, *Dictionary of Early Buddhist Monastic Terms*, passim.
104 *Arthaśāstra*, 2.11.
105 *Ibid.*, 2.11.98, 101. Cf. *Medinīkośa—Kañcuko vārabāṇe syānnirmoke kavacepi ca vardhāpakagṛhitāṅgasthitavastre ca colake*, quoted, L.P. Pandey, *op. cit.*, p. 181.
106 Charles Fabri, *Indian Dress*, pp. 3ff.
107 *Ibid.*, p. 7.
108 *Amarakośa*, 2.6.118—*Colaḥ kūrpāsakostriyām.*
109 *Abhijñānaśakuntalam*, 1. preceding verse 18.
110 *Vikramorvaśīya*, 4.7.
111 *Harṣacarita*, p. 98.
112 *Mbh.*, 2.60.15.
113 *Ibid.*, 2.60.25.
114 *Ibid.*, 2.60.28.
115 *Ibid.*, 2.60.47.
116 *NŚ*. 21, 12.
117 *Ibid.*, 21.13-14.
118 *Ibid.*, 21.15-21.
119 Cf. *kuṇḍalam adharapālyām macakam karṇaśaṣkulyā madhyachhidre kṛtam* (*AB* on *NŚ*, 21.16.).
120 *Kīlā ūrdhvacchidre uttarakarṇiketi prasiddhā. Ibid., l.c.*
121 *Harṣakam samudgakam sarpādirūpatayā prasiddham. Ibid., l.c.*
122 *Veṭiketi sūkśmakaṭakarūpa aṅgulimudrā pakṣipadmādvākareṇopetā. Ibid*, 21. 17.
123 *Rucaka iti karagalaka-vitataḥ ūrdhve cūliketi prasiddho nikuñcakaḥ. Ibid.*, 21.18.
124 *Talakam nābheradhaḥ tasyāpyadhaḥ sūtrakam. Ibid.*, 21. 20.
125 According to Abhinava on the top of the head, a snake-like ornament of gold and precious stones was used and was called *Śikhā-*

vyāla. Around it circular leaves were fashioned as *pindīpattra*. *Cūḍāmaṇi* was in the middle, then came *makarikā* or *makarapattra*. At the edge of the forehead was the pearl net (*muktājāla*) called 'archway' (*toraṇa*) or 'lattice' (*jālikā*). *Ibid*., 21. 22.

126 According to Abhinava *śikhipattra* was a bejewelled ear pendant of the shape of the peacock's tail.

127 There are several references to *kuṇḍala* in literature (e.g. *Buddhacarita*, 1, 2.7; 1, 3. 18; 1, 5.41; *Saundarananda*, 10.20; *Raghuvaṁśa*, 9.51). *Kuṇḍalas* of gold (*pravarakāñcane kuṇḍaleṣu*) are referred to in the *Ṛtusaṁhāra* (3.19). There are references to *ratnakuṇḍalas* (*Buddhacarita*, 1, 5.53; *Saundarananda*, 4.16; cf. *Harṣacarita : eka Sanskritika Adhyayana*, pp. 44, 47, 56, 60). Kādambarī and betel-bearer are said to be wearing *makarakuṇḍalas*. Cf. *Kādambarī : eka Sanskritika Adhyayana*, p. 247.

128 The *dantapura* seems to be a popular ear ornament and is referred to in several texts.

Chapter 5

Aspects of Social Life : Structure, Institutions and Values

In the Introduction to his *Social History* Trevelyan has remarked that at bottom the appeal of history is imaginative. "Our imagination craves to behold our ancestors as they really were, going about their daily business and daily pleasure."[1] As we read old texts "they take form, colour, gesture, passion, thought."[2] This is particularly true of the study of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. From it we learn how men and women in that age dressed and appeared, moved and spoke, what their characteristic pursuits and emotional responses were. The whole spectacle of shapes and sounds of a vanished age lies implicitly in the theatrical prescriptions of Bharata. While it is a tempting pasture for the social historian in one sense, in another it would be a disappointment. For obvious reasons what is emphasized in the *NŚ* is the human spectacle, not the legal-institutional framework of constraints. For the reconstruction of social conditions, thus, the evidence of the *NŚ* needs to be analysed in the context of relevant evidence from other sources. Its unique virtue lies in the fact that it illumines some aspects of social life over which other sources are quite naturally silent.

Social representation *(lokānukaraṇa)* was an acknowledged primary object of drama, although it intended to communicate an inner experience through its medium.[3] The practical constraints of the stage necessarily made this representation a mixture of realistic and conventional elements. This was clearly recognised and the aspects of representation were called *lokadharmī* and *nāṭyadharmī*.[4] *Lokadharmī* consists of natural feelings and conditions *(svabhāvabhāvopagatam)*, social usage and behaviour *(lokavārtākriyopetam)* and natural acting *(svabhāvābhinayopetam)*.[5] *Loka* or society is here understood as an order based on human nature *(svabhāva)* and established usage *(vārtā)*.[6] The general presumption was that the constituents of human nature are universal, though each individual has a specific character formed by his own actions.[7] It is recognised, however, that social position also reflects the level and quality of a person's conduct, but this quality is cultural rather than ethical.[8] Social usage or action patterns *(lokavyavahāra)* depend on natural drives *(kāma)* as well as the norms

of moral law *(dharma)*.[9] Human nature, thus, is not considered to be intrinsically constituted or determined by social development.[10] Although the specificity of Indian social order was well recognised it was not understood in terms of any socio-historical determinism.[11] It was believed to be the result of a unique and timeless tradition.[12] The fact is that in ancient India as in medieval Europe, human society was understood in terms of cosmic and moral constraints rather than in terms of ephemeral historical and economic relations.[13] For this reason, the theme and practice of drama tended to be, on the whole, conservative, taking the social order for granted and concentrating mainly on the psychic and moral roots of human conduct. In picturing the *loka* the *NŚ* also took for granted the other *śāstràs* dealing with *dharma, artha* and *kāma*.

In representing society, drama did not intend to present a documentary, but to create a suggestive image and for this reason no attempt was made to develop elaborate realism. The stage-craft depended on the extensive use of signs, symbols, and purely conventional representation called *nāṭyadharmī*.[14] If *lokadharmī* meant 'belonging to the world', *nāṭyadharmī* meant 'belonging to the stage'. The latter, thus, meant not only conventional but creative innovation of the theatre also. Dance and music came under this category. Speech and emotions were rendered with much natural realism, but mountains, vehicles, aerial cars, celestial weapons etc., could be shown by personification or by signs and suggestions.[15] The chariot, thus, could be indicated by the charioteer appearing to hold the reins, its motion by gestures suggestive of the sensation of the breeze flowing past. Instead of concentrating on mechanical contrivances and material reconstruction of things and detailed sets containing the exact replicas of social scenes the *NŚ* concentrates on the elaborate language of gestures and symbols which dancers and actors had developed.

The two *dharmīs* or dramatic modes, thus, briefly correspond to Nature *(svabhāva)* and Image *(vibhāva)*, the latter subsisting only in a dramatic spectacle.[16] The real world exists in a natural mode leading to experiences of pleasure and pain but it can become the occasion of pure enjoyment *(rasa)* only when it is transformed into a spectacle.[17]

The broad divisions of society in the *NŚ* may be said to comprise of classes, castes and professions. The general picture of these in the *NŚ* is more complex than that of the Vedic age. Thus, the Vedic janas find no mention in the *NŚ*; on the other hand, its structure of *varṇas* and *jātis* is more detailed. Also, it has no trace of any kind of feudal hierarchy. The term *sāmanta* does not occur, nor does the term

kṣatrapa. Slaves are known, but there is hardly any difference between slave and servant. Merchants, caravan leaders and trade with distant places are known, but market places, bargaining, and the profit motive receive hardly any attention. The emphasis is on royal and aristocratic adventure, heroism, war and romance. Ministers and merchants pursue adventures of love. Ascetics of all kinds flit across the stage but they do not occupy its centre. The society of the *NŚ* may be seen as a link between the epic society where merchants hardly figure and the society of the *Bṛhatkathā* where the desire for gain at least rivals that for honour. This society is glimpsed by us in terms of its leading sentiments, ideal character types and stock themes as formalised for the *Daśarūpaka*. The *NŚ* like all ancient works viewed society as a hierarchical organisation in which men were grouped in different strata and ranked as high and low. This was done in several ways, according to *prakṛti*, *varṇa*, *jāti* and *śilpa*, that is to say, culture, character (nature), caste and profession were the principal scores on whice social ranking depended.[18] It is notable that wealth as such is not so recognised formally, although in practice it must undoubtedly have played a prominent part just as the formal ranking of the Brāhmaṇas by *varṇa* must have been in practice often superseded by the actual position of royalty.[19]

The most characteristic division of men and women in the *NŚ* is on the basis of their nature or *prakṛti*. "'Briefly, the nature of men and women is recognised to be threefold, superior, inferior and middling."[20] The superior nature *(prakṛtiruttamā)* is known for its self-control, wisdom, skill in diverse crafts, consideration, lofty objectives, reassuring those in fear, knowledge of different sciences *(śāstras)*, depth and magnanimity and for the virtues of firmness and sacrifice.[21] The middling nature is known for its proficiency in conducting social business *(lokopacāra)*, skill in practical arts *(śilpasūtras)*, professional knowledge and pleasing manners *(vijñānamādhuryayutā)*.[22] The inferior type of men are of harsh speech, bad character, bad constitution, *(kusattvāḥ)*, dull, irascible, hurting, disloyal to friends, fault-finding back-biting, aggressive in speech, ungrateful, lazy, lacking discrimination between those who deserve and those who do not deserve respect, flirtatious, quarrelsome, infamous, sinful and snatching other people's wealth.[23] Thus these three types are distinguished by their character *(śīla)*.[24] In the case of women, the superior type is noted for its gentleness, steadiness, smiling speech, compassion, service to elders, modesty, courtesy, natural qualities of beauty, noble descent and sweetness.[25] The middling women have these qualities in a limited manner and only slight blemishes. The inferior women are similar

to the inferior men.[26]

It is noteworthy that in this description the inferior men and women are alike characterised by their lack of moral virtues. They are at the mercy of their passions, lack all discipline. The two higher types, on the other hand, are distinguished not only by their moral virtues but also by their knowledge and practical skills. The women also have in addition the faminine virtues in an ample measure. So far the distinction rests only on moral and cultural qualities, but in the case of superior women it is clearly stated that they have a noble descent *(abhijana).* Although that is not explicitly stated in the case of men, it may be supposed that it is implicitly meant there also. This converts a typology of 'character' into a social hierarchy. 'High', 'middle' and 'low' are not merely moral and cultural standards but also social ranks, that is to say, they came to signify the norms of behaviour expected of or imputed to the different rungs of the social hierarchy.

From the dramatic point of view the high and middling types of heroes may be bold *(dhīroddhata)*, graceful *(lalita)*, noble *(dhīrodātta)*, or tranquil *(dhīrapraśānta)*.[27] The gods exemplify the first, the kings the second, the chief of the army and the ministers the third, and the Brāhmaṇas and the merchants the fourth.[28] This means that only kings are to be represented as heroic and graceful, gods as only bold heroes, ministers and commanders as noble heroes only, while Brāhmaṇas and traders are to be represented as tranquil heroes only.[29] Here, too, we have an implicit social hierarchy; below the gods we have the ascetics, then the rulers and their dependents followed by high military and civil officials. Below them we have the Brāhmaṇas and merchants. These different groups constitute the high and middling classes. If gods and ascetics are left out of consideration, for they were not accepted as heroes in the principal forms of classical drama, we have the kings, officials, Brāhmaṇas and merchants as the upper class of society. The kings could be the heroes of the *Nāṭaka*, the rest of the *Prakaraṇa*. The heroes of the latter could be Brāhmaṇas and priests, merchants and carvan leaders, ministers and officials.[30] They are collectively the householders or *kuṭumbinaḥ*.[31]

As for the lower classes from which high culture was not expected, we have labourers, despised professions, barbarians, parasites and criminals. The *NŚ* does not have much to say about them because they did not play any important part in the drama.[32] In the society which the drama represented these classes could only have had a marginal position.

The division according to varṇa was the most ancient. The *NŚ*

uses the word *cāturvarṇya* to indicate the whole universe of characters, or the concourse of the four varṇas as is the usual meaning.[33] Various kinds of Brāhmaṇas are mentioned. The highest apparently were the sages, *ṛṣis* or *purodhases* and the teachers especially of the Vedic lore. The Brāhmaṇas could be found among ministers and officials advising and assisting the king, among ascetics and among the householders in different professions. Their characterstic roles which drama represented were those of teachers, priests and counsellors. The potrayal of the Vidūṣaka or jester possibly represents a satire on Brāhmaṇical dependence on royal patronage, interest in food, keen with and philosophical humour. But the Vidūṣaka was a real counsellor to the king and himself the real satirist.[34] While kings, warriors and officials are prominently represented on the stage, the Kṣatriyas as such find little mention. In the Vedic and Epic ages the Kṣatriyas or Rājanyas constituted the ruling class, but the situation changed drastically from the 4th cent. B.C. Mahāpadmananda not only founded a non-Kṣatriya dynasty but is said to have uprooted the ancient Kṣatriya ruling families.[35] The Brāhmaṇas questioned the Kṣatriya status of the Mauryas[36] and in the post-Maurya period we have the Brāhmaṇas assuming royal power in the Śuṅga, Kāṇva and Sātavāhana dynasties. Besides, there was a flood of barbarian rulers—the Śakas, the Yavanas, the Pahlavas and the Kuṣāṇas. The Brāhmaṇical authors of the *Smṛtis* indeed, liked to give them a position within the orthodox social order[37] but in the period between 2nd cent. B.C. and 2nd cent. A.D. it would have been hazardous to presume or proclaim the identity of the rulers and the Kṣatriyas on the stage. This was probably why the *NŚ* emphasizes royalty and the warriors and the officials but not the Kṣatriyas as such. The ruler is expected to fit the role of a just and romantic hero. He is not directly satirized as boastful, ambitious, tyrannical or lustful, but this image is regularly attributed to the Śakāra who is a despised 'brother-in-law' of the king.[38]

It has been noted earlier that the Vaiśyas as such figured more in Brāhmaṇic theoretical and legal works than in records dealing with actual social usage.[39] Thus Buddhist writings and even Aśoka refer to the common people by other names.[40] The Vaiśyas included householders engaged in agriculture as well as business.[41] In the *NŚ* a prominent role is recognised for shopkeepers, long-distance traders and bankers, vaṇij, sārthavāha and śreṣṭhin respectively. They are represented as mild-mannered but capable of heroism, fortitude and magnanimity. They are wealthy but not satirized for inordinate greed, miserliness or extortionate money-lending. While the satirical images of the priest and the ruler may be seen in the Vidūṣaka and the

Śakāra, it is curious that no image of this kind is available for the mercantile class. There is, of course, the Viṭa, who is adventurous and clever but a not too scrupulous man about town. His caste or profession are not determinate but he has a ready wit, urban polish and aesthetic taste and vices such as gambling, duelling, associating with public women etc. He represents the image of the depraved bourgeois but is hardly intended satirically. He represents the typical qualities and vices of city life; its refinement and artistic taste as also its unprincipled search for pleasure and adventure.[42]

The Śūdras are mentioned as one of the four varṇas who constituted the spectators in the theatre.[43] In the north-eastern sector of the theatre the pillar named after the Śūdras was to be placed and was to be blue in colour. Kṛśarā or a food of rice and pulses was to be given away in the fixing of the pillar and iron was to be placed at its base. The obvious symbolism of the procedure is quite instructive. Associated with the Brāhmaṇas are *ghee*, white colour, gold at the base and the gift of *pāyasa* (i.e. *khīr*). These obviously suggest purity and wisdom. With the Kṣatriyas our text associates red colour, copper at the base, and the gift of rice cooked with *guḍa*. These suggest energy, authority and substantial food. With the Vaiśya were associated yellow colour, silver at the base and rice cooked with *ghee*. These suggest mildness and wealth. The associated items of the Śūdras as mentioned above would suggest ignorance, poverty and hardihood.[44] The four varṇas are symbolised by the four pillars which support the theatre. Each had a distinct contribution—wisdom, energy, wealth and hardihood respectively. Rice is common to all but its further ingredient is different. The Śūdra's ignorance symbolised by the blue colour is constituted by his being banned from the Vedic study. This did not debar him from reaching the same truth through the *itihāsa-purāṇa* and now especially through the fifth *Veda* of the *Nāṭya*. Nor were they debarred from the practice of the arts and crafts, useful or fine. Indeed, the entire profession of the actors was condemned as being of the Śūdras.[45]

The problem of adjusting diverse social and ethnic groups within the scheme of the four varṇas had been solved by the *Sūtras* and the *Smṛtis* by elaborating the concept of jāti and miscegenation. The *Manusmṛti* gives it a systematic and elaborate exposition.[46] In the *NŚ*, hardly any reference is to be found to these mixed jātis, from which it may be concluded that they did not constitute any distinct and prominent element of the social spectacle. Apparently, their dress, appearence, speech and manners approximated to those of the primary varṇas. On the other hand, the *NŚ* does mention a number

of these ethnic groups as jātis which included frontier or immigrant peoples or refer to specific janapadas. Thus, we have mention of the Kirātas, Barbaras, Āndhras, Drāviḍas, Kaśī-Kośalans and Pulindas who were all to be represented as dark in complexion.[47] Again, there is mention of the Śakas, Yavanas, Pahlavas and Bāhlikas who were to be represented as fair.[48]

The bulk of the society was described as consisting of householders or *kuṭumbinaḥ* who would be distinguished from the kings and the religieux[49] on the one hand and the slaves and barbarians on the other. This concept of the *kuṭumbinaḥ* is reminiscent of the Vedic *viśaḥ* and the Buddhist and Jaina householder—*gahapati* or *gāhāvai*. The real division amongst them was in terms of professions. It is the characteristics of these that the producer has to study carefully. "*Anekaśilpajātāni naikakarma-kriyāṇi ca / Tānyaśeṣāṇi rūpāṇi kartavyāni prayoktṛbhiḥ.*"[50]

The professions as found in the *NŚ* may be broadly divided into two categories viz., the service of the king in the palace *(antaḥpura)* or outside (*bāhya*), and diverse arts and crafts. 'Outside Service' under the king includes several distinct offices of diverse levels. The king stood at the head followed by the commander-in-chief, the priest, the ministers and secretaries, the judges and the princes. At the bottom were the officials generally who were divided into various grades. "*Rājā Senāpatiścaiva purodhā mantriṇastathā/Sacivaḥ prāḍvivākśca kumārādhikṛtastathā//*"[51] Abhinava Gupta, however, explains that *rājā* here stands not for the king, but for the heir-apparent (*yuvarāia*).[52] This is plausible because the list of eight offices in this verse would then describe public offices *(bāhya-parivāra)* of the king as distinguished from the eighteen offices of the palace *(antaḥpura)*. The *rājā* or *yuvarāja* was expected to have high moral and intellectual qualifications, practical ability and tact. He was to have the virtues of truth, persistence, foresight, enthusiasm, care and insight. He was to take the vow of protecting the people like the Lokapālas, understand the minds of others, have heroic qualities, practical knowledge and efficiency, self-control and a mild temper with a sweet tongue. He was to follow the elders, patronize the arts, and have the knowledge of the *Arthaśāstra*, *Nītiśāstra* and *Dharmaśāstra*.[53] He was to be free from addictions and vices and above all he was to have love for the people, a quality which the *Arthaśāstra* describes as the source of royal virtues *(anurāgo hi sārvaguṇyam)*.[54] The priest and the minister or counsellor were to be highborn, but not of foreign birth, intelligent, learned in the diverse *śāstras*, loyal, cautious, free from greed, disciplined, pure and virtuous.[55] The qualities of the secretary were similar. The

commander-in-chief was expected to be intelligent, proficient in policy, sweet-spoken but having an insight into the weaknesses of the enemy and the timing of a campaign, knowledge of the *Arthaśāstra*, loyal, scion of a noble family and proficient in the knowledge of the right time and place for the execution of a policy.[56] The judges were to be knowledgeable in the principles of law, intelligent and well-read, neutral, righteous, endowed with firmness and discrimination between right and wrong, forbearing, disciplined, having vanquished anger and acquired an impartial vision.[57] Such judges were to be placed on the bench *(dharmāsana)*. They were to follow the school of Bṛhaspati in determining the number and nature of assessors *(sabhyas)*.[58]

Abhinava interprets '*kumārādhikṛta*' as '*kumārāṇām rājaputrāṇām rakṣārtham adhikṛtaḥ*'.[59] The term is reminiscent of the Gupta term *kumārāmātya*. However, Abhinavagupta's interpretation is doubtful, since the description here is of public offices, not palace offices. The qualities of these seem to be taken out of the list for the judges. This would suit interpreting them as senior executives rather than as the companions or attendents of the princes.

The *mahāmātra* apparently described the high officials at the level of the *senāpati* and *yuvarāja*.[60] They were represented on the stage with a half crown on their head. *Amātya* was apparently a lower office meriting only a turban but similar to the banker or śreṣṭhin in this respect.[61] A more general designation was 'royal servitor' or *rājasevaka* which may be compared with the *yukta* of the *Arthaśāstra* or the *yukta* or *puruṣa* of the Aśokan epigraphs.[62]

Of the professional arts and crafts we have an interesting list in the members of the panels of the judges or jury (*prāśnikas*) to whom the relative evaluation of a theatrical production was referred in the event of a competition.[63] This panel included one member each of the following—ritualist priest (*yajñavit*),dancer (*nartaka*),painter (*citrakṛt*), hetaira *(veśyā)*, expert in metres *(chandovit)*, linguist or grammarian *(śabdavit)*, expert in arms *(śastravit)*, musician *(gāndharva)* and royal servant *(rājasevaka)*. The clerk *(lekhaka)* gave support to the committee. Among other arts and professions we hear of the soldiers *(yodhā)*, gamblers *(dīvyat)*, ranchers *(ghoṣaka)*. undertakers, *(pulkasa)*, charcoal burners *(aṅgārakāraka)*, hunters *(vyādha)*, makers of wooden machines *(kāṣṭhayantropajīvin)*, foresters *(vanaukas)*, excavators of mines *(suraṅgākhanaka)*, joiners *(sandhikāra)*, grooms *(aśvarakṣa)*, charioteers *(sūta)*.[64] To these we may add architects, carpenters, masons, brick-layers, rope-makers, stone-cutters, sculptors, metal-workers and workers in precious stones as these are implied in the descriptions of architecture, weapons, armaments and metals. So are spinners, wea-

vers, tillers, herdsmen, and cooks in the descriptions of clothes and food. Craftsmen were generally designated *kāruka* or *śilpin* and recognised as a distinct class.[65]

Additional information is available in the *NŚ* about the professions of women especially in the context of the establishment of the royal palace. Even apart from the palace we hear of the female slaves *(dāsī)*, craftswomen *(kāruśilpinī)*, nurses *(dhātrī)*, actresses or those engaged in show-business *(raṅgopajīvinī)*, tale-tellers *(kathinī)*, singers and hair-dressers.[66] *Liṅginī* according to Abhinava meant painter but it might simply mean one living as a religieux. In the palace women were employed in a variety of jobs and corresponding skills must have existed outside the palace also.[67] Thus we have crafts women *(śilpakārikāḥ)* of various types *(nānāśilpavicakṣaṇāḥ)* and those skilled in the art of perfumes and flowers *(gandhapuṣpa-vibhāgajñāḥ)* and arranging of seats and beds *(śayanāsana-bhāgajñāḥ)*. They were expected to be clever, sweet, adroit, mild, clear, smooth and quiet. Another class of jobs was performed by stage performers or *Nāṭakīyās*. They were to be skilled in music, portrayal of moods, sentiments and acting. They were to be quick in improvisation and young and beautiful. The dancer was a class apart. She was to be able to display skill in musical instruments, with all limbs fully trained, acquainted with the sixty-four arts *(catuṣṣaṣṭhikalānvitā)*,[68] clever, courteous, bold, free from the typical faminine faults, industrious, knowledgeable in diverse arts *(nānāśilpaprayogajñā)* and perspicacious in dance and music. She was also to be gifted with a voice which was to be at once delicate, sweet, smooth, reasonant and marvellous. She was expected to be outstanding among other women by the glow of her beauty and youth.

Women attendents in the royal palace were divided into three classes viz. *anucārikā*, *paricārikā* and *saṁcārikā*.[69] The *anucārikās* were constant attendents like a shadow, never leaving the king. The *paricārikās* included bed-room attendents *(śayyāpālī)*, umbrella-bearers, fan-bearers, shampooers, mixers of perfumes, dressers *(prāsadhikās)* or those who helped in the putting on of ornaments or prepared garlands. *Saṁcārikās* kept watch over different halls, gardens, temples, pleasure-palaces, and also kept time. They were also used as messengers.

Elderly women *(mahattarāḥ)* were used to look after the security of inner apartments and also to utter benediction and welcome.[70] *Pratihārīs* were employed to report matters arising from treaty, war and other public business.[71] Young girls as well as old women worked in the palace. Given the charge of diverse offices they were called *āyuktikās*. Thus they looked after the stores *(bhāṇḍāgāreṣu)*, the armoury *(āyudhādhikṛtāḥ)*, supervised fruits, roots and plants, gave thought

to perfumes, decorations, dresses and garlands.[72]

It is worth noting that in the detailed description there is no reference to the employment of *yavanīs* or women body-guards, nor to the betel-bearers *(tāmbūlavāhinī)*.[73] This tends to confirm the relative antiquity of the tradition on which the *NŚ* is largely based.

Thus service with the king included service within the palace and outside. The former, called *antaḥpura*, had eighteen constituents of which twelve have been detailed above.[74] To these were added the five types of women in the palace who were not servitors, but the objects of love, affection or patronage of the king. These were the chief queen *(mahādevī)*, the other queens *(devyaḥ)*, the daughters of the officials residing in the palace *(svāminyaḥ)*, royal mistresses *(sthāpitāḥ)* and those who were given grants and patronage *(bhoginyaḥ)*. To these have to be added three types of eunuchs—*kāruka*, *kañcukīya*, and *varṣavara* constituting a single class to complete the number eighteen.

Structured by *prakṛti*, *varṇa*, *jāti* and *śilpa* the society of the *NŚ* was divided into a hierarchy of ranks. This can be seen most clearly by attending to the modes of address which are prescribed in the *NŚ*.[75] At the top are placed the sages who are the gods of the gods themselves. They are to be addressed as *bhagavān* or 'Lord'. Gods, ascetics and great scholars are to be similarly addressed as *bhagavān*. The Brāhmaṇa is to be addressed as *ārya* or noble person. The ruler is to be addressed as *mahārāja* 'or great king'. The teacher should be called *upādhyāya* and older people *tāta*. The Brānmaṇas could address the king by his name or as just king. This should be acceptable to the kings because the Brāhmaṇas are superior.[76] The minister or *saciva* is to be addressed by the Brāhmaṇas as *amātya* or *saciva*, but the others of lower rank *(hinaiḥ)* must address him always as *ārya*. Among equals the address is to be by name; the superior is to be addressed with the surname joined to the name. Where men and women hold offices, they are to be addressed by their office. Artisans and craftsmen are to be addressed by their profession. These modes of address are indicative of a socially egalitarian sense. Those who are a little inferior are to be addressed as *mārṣa* or *bhāva*. An equal may be addressed as friend or *vayasya*. An inferior may be addressed as *haṁho*, *handā*. The charioteer is to address the passengers as *āyuṣman*. Ascetics are to be addressed as such viz., *tapasvin* or *sādho*. The heir-apparent is to be addressed as *svāmin*, other princes as *bhaṭṭāraka*. The ascetics of the Buddhist and Jaina orders are to be addressed as *bhadanta*. The other ascetics are to addressed according to their respective sects. The king is to be addressed by the people as *deva*,

but the emperor *(sārvabhauma)* is to be addressed as *bhaṭṭa*.[77]

The husband was to be addressed by the wife as *āryaputra* when young, and *ārya* otherwise. The wife was to be called as *āryā* or the daughter or mother of such and such. Women ascetics and goddesses were to be addressed as *bhagavatī*. Ladies were to be called *bhadrā* (good women) and elderly ones *ambā* (mother). Queens were to be addressed as *bhaṭṭinī*, *svāminī* and *devī*. Maidens were to be addressed by servants as *bhartṛdārikā*. Women were to address each other as *halā* and their maids as *hañjā*.

This system of social addressing reaffirms the general principles of hierarchy emerging earlier. The sages and ascetics enjoyed the highest status, the Brāhmaṇas came next and then the kings. Below them came the officials, traders and bankers. Artisans and craftsmen were given due respect except when they happened to be menials or servants. It is curious that the *NŚ* does not refer to the guilds at all. This could be due to the fact that their belonging to a guild probably made no difference to the representation of traders and craftsmen on the stage.[78]

Social differences were reflected in speech, dress, hair-style etc., also. The rulers were supposed to speak in chaste Sanskrit termed *āryabhāṣā*, but the spoken language of the common people was called *jātibhāṣā* and could be either of the bordering areas which have many barbarian words *(melcchaśabda)* or of the *Bhāratavarṣa*.[79] This *jātibhāṣā* itself could be Prakrit or Sanskrit.[80] The heroes were to speak in Sanskrit normally but could use Prakrit for some reason. Ascetics of diverse kinds including mendicants and the Bhāgavatas, women and those belonging to low jātis were to speak in Prakrit. So also those who did not have the opportunity of studying on account of poverty or were sunk in poverty or were spoilt rich people or were uneducated people of the upper class.[81] Educated ascetics, queens, hetairas and women versed in arts and crafts[82] could speak in Sanskrit. It follows, thus, that Sanskrit was primarily the mark of education, high social position and office. The people, especially when uneducated, extremely poor or of low social strata spoke dialects called Prakrit. These dialects differed according to regions and the *NŚ* mentions seven *bhāṣās* and seven *vibhāṣās*, the former being well-known varieties of Prakrit while the latter were dialects of non-Aryan languages.[83]

In appearence the upper two varṇas were represented as fair in complexion while the Vaiśyas and Śudrās were represented as dark.[84] Brahmacārins, mendicants, amātyas and priests shaved their beard completely while kings, princes and those dependent on the kings trimmed their beard in diverse ways. Those in trouble or engaged in austerities let the beard grow even though it had been shaved earlier.

Sages and ascetics engaged in long vows kept long beards.[85]

Kings had gorgeous dresses, but old men, Brāhmaṇas, *śreṣṭhīs*, amātyas, *purodhas*, traders *(vaṇijaḥ)*, chamberlains *(kañcukīyas)* and ascetics donned clean clothes.[86] Both the garments, the lower *(vāsas)* and the upper *(ūrdhvāmbarāṇi)*, were to be either pure (white) or red.[87] This choice of colour could only be a theatrical convention. Or else, *rakta* probably meant a 'pleasing' or 'striking' colour. The mendicants put on ochre-coloured robes. The servitors in the inner apartments of the palace wore ochre-coloured coats *(kañcukapaṭa)*.[88] The warriors donned armour, quiver and bow. Kings wore a crown, the higher officials *(mahāmatrās)* like the senāpati or yuvarāja used only a half crown *(ardhamukuṭa)*. The ministers, chamberlains, bankers and priests donned turbans. In fact, this can be seen in the sculptures of Bharhut and Sanci.[89]

Apart from romance and fun, politics was the principal theme of drama, and we thus get a glimpse of political ideals and realities as presupposed in the *NŚ*. Heroic epics, and the history and legends of Udayana formed the basic source material for themes of dramatic works, especially of the earlier period. The *Bṛhatkathā* and the exploits of some other famous rulers were added to this stock repertoire in later times. The *Arthaśāstra* describes the king as *vijigīṣu*, the would-be conqueror and the state as surrounded by a number of other states as part of an international system or *maṇḍala* in which diplomacy was well-developed. Within the state the king had a well-organised administrative machinery for his assistance. This picture generally holds true of royalty and polity as glimpsed in the *NŚ*. In the *āviddha* type of drama with *dīptarasa*, the commotion, tumult and stampede of war, personal combat and siege figure prominently. Intrigue and revolutions occur and so do diplomatic parleys and challenges.[90] But despite the accepted norm of waging war to show royal prowess or gain some specific end, the overall purpose of political life was to ensure peace, prosperity, culture and justice for the people. Peace required firm authority, prosperity depended on people attending to their work and reasonable luck with respect to rains, culture depended on the royal patronage of learning, religion and art, justice on the integrity of the kings and the soundness of his choice of judges. High moral, intellectual, martial and practical qualities were expected of the king as mentioned before. He was to be an adept in the śāstras dealing with *dharma* and *artha*, heroic and noble, and above all motivated by love for the people. A verse of the *NŚ* praises the virtues of the king thus : "The earth worships you with its happy janapadas and burgeoning grains and mines, the Vindhyas and other mountains

bow to you with the elephants romping in palm forests, the oceans bow to you with their wavy arms full of pearls released by splitting shells, the great rivers celebrate your renown while cheered by frolicking water-animals."[91] In this verse, apparently of some poet from the Deccan, the general notion of what constitutes the success of the ruler is expressed.

The king was regarded as setting the standard of conduct for the people and was thus looked upon as a leader in the true sense. "Whatever the things which the king does through pleasure or pain in diverse spheres of conduct, all that is imitated by the people *(yān yān prakurute rājā tānstān loko'nuvartate)*.[92] This agrees with the elitist view expressed in the *Gītā—Yadyad ācarati śreṣṭhastattadevetaro janaḥ/ Sa yat pramāṇam kurute lokastadanuvartate//*[93] The *NŚ* specially admonishes the kings not to use force or authority where gaining the affection of a woman was concerned.[94]

The king is declared to have a human nature tinged with divinity—*prakṛtiḥ rājñām vai divyamānuṣi.* The kings are born of a divine portion *(devāṁśajāstu rājāno)* as has been declared in the *Vedas* and *Vedānta (vedādhyātmasu kīrtitāḥ)*.[95] Hence they could imitate the gods without any blemish.

For the assistance of the kings there were diverse officials, the higher grade being of the *mahāmātras*, the lower of *adhikṛtas* and *āyuktas*. At the bottom were the servants. There is no direct reference to the mantripariṣad, but an incidental reference does remind one of the *Arthaśāstra* in this context—*Parṣadam deśakālau cāpyarthayuktim avekṣya ca.*[96] The *yuvarāja* or crown-prince has a special importance and this reminds one of the Aśokan set-up.[97] The royal household was polygamous but the king did not as yet require constant armed protection.

The ancient drama gave full recognition to the fact of strife in the society and cosmos. The strife of gods and the titans constituted the central theme of the more ancient types of drama[98] and mythically symbolised the conflict of right and wrong. In the purely human drama as represented in the nāṭaka and the prakaraṇa, this element of conflict is retained. In the heroic plays this is quite clear and generally takes the form of a war between rival heroes. War plainly emerges as a significant fact of political life and fighting is accepted as a part of the heroic way of life. In the war of gods and titans deception was accepted as legtimate, but in the war between human heroes honour and truth were to be fully preserved.[99] War was not a species of deception but the performance of a duty placed on the ruler or warrior in the spirit of heroic idealism.

While the king was expected to participate in the war personally, the head of the army, the senāpati was one of the higher officials or mahāmātras of the state. There was an armoury or āyudhāgāra in the palace with a separate official in charge of it.[100] The soldiers or *yodhās* were supplied with a special dress—*sāṅgrāmika veśa.* It included a protective armour, a head-dress, bow and quiver. Chariots, elephants and horses were used in the battle.[101] A variety of weapons are mentioned—*bhindī, kunta* or javelin, *śataghnī, śūla, tomara, śakti*, bow and arrow, *gadā* or club, *vajra*, sword, *cakra* or discuss, *prāsa, paṭṭiśa, daṇḍa* and *kheṭaka.*[102] The significance of *śataghnī* is not certain but it seems to indicate some engine which threw out stones or pellets at the enemy. *Tomara* might have been a heavy club and similar to *gadā.*[103a] *Kunta, śakti, śūla* and *prāsa* apparently were javelins of different kinds which could be thrust or flung from a distance. The bow was to have a length of two *hastas* while the sword was required to have a length of forty *aṅgulas.*[103b]

A verse quoted by the *NŚ* describes the army in battle as crowded by diverse horses, elephants, chariots and warriors, with numerous weapons such as hundreds of arrows, javelins, swords and sticks, with prancing horses and fear and agitation all around owing to the clang of weapons.[104] But the troops were not an untrained crowd. The soldiers were drilled in the use of arms. The striking of weapons required specific stances and movement-sequences called *cārīs* which were used in dance also—*Cārībhiḥ śastra-mokṣaśca cāryo yuddhe ca kīrtitāḥ.*[105] Six different kinds of stances or *sthānas* have been recognised for striking with weapons (*śastravimokṣaṇa*).[106] Regular training and exercise was prescribed.[107] Co-ordinated movements forming *maṇḍalas* were recommended in battle.[108]

Apart from the use of weapons, unarmed cambat and fisticuffs were given special importance. They were called *niyuddha* and the special 'approaches' adopted in these were called *nyāya.*[109] Four of these are described. Indeed the very birth of the *vṛttis* is ascribed to the beautiful style of moving the limbs which Viṣṇu adopted in his fight with Madhu and Kaiṭabha.

The standard of the army was the symbol of its honour. The conch and the drum were regularly associated with military marches.[110]

The picture of religion in the *NŚ* resembles that of the post-Vedic but pre-classical times. It may be compared to that found in the early strata of the Epics before the deification of the heroes as generally recognised incarnations of God. Indeed, the *NŚ* largely reflects the popular polytheism of the Vedic era where gods are worshipped in their plurality and picturesqueness and have yet not been overshad-

owed by the emergence of the one God at the popular level. However, while a multiplicity of Vedic gods are mentioned, it is clear that the trinity of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva is tending to emerge, which is a post-Vedic feature. Though the rise of the trinity is visible it is not yet conceived as the triune expression of one god. Nor is the conception of incarnation given any importance.[111a] The gods are conceived in a fully anthropomorphic manner as in the Epics and Purāṇas and their mythical contests with the asuras form a prominent theme in festivals as well as drama. Nevertheless, the iconography of gods has not developed yet and they appear to have been represented on the stage very much like human heroes. Although sacrificial ritual is still preserved in worship, it is simplified and mixed with the new aesthetic elements of music, dance and flowers.[111b] The ascetic sects of the Buddhists, Jainas, the Bhāgavatas and the Pāśupatas are familiar and distinguished from Brāhmaṇical mendicants, asectics and hermits. However, except for Brāhmaṇical seers and hermits, the *NŚ* does not appear to regard the other varieties of ascetics with any real respect. In fact, it visualises hypocritical and false ascetics as involved in intrigues and as suitable subjects for satire.[112]

Among the Vedic gods we find mention of Brahmā, the Creator, who is the special patron of the sage Bharata and thus of the *Nāṭyaveda*. Mahendra is the chief of the gods. His festival is celebrated as flag festival and provides the occasion for the putting up of dramatic productions.[113] Viṣṇu is a great god and the source of the *vṛttis*.[114] The myth of his resting on the *śeṣaśayyā* after the deluge is referred to. Among his names *Acyuta*, *Hari*, *Nārāyaṇa* and *Madhusūdana* are mentioned. His fight with Madhu and Kaiṭabha and the fear and prayer of Brahmā are reminiscent of the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa.* Śiva is easily the most prominent god of the *NŚ* since he is the source of dancing.[115] He is addressed as *Trinetra*, *Deveśa*, *Mahādeva* and *Bhuvaneśvara*. He dwells in the Himālayas, is surrounded by the *bhūtagaṇas* and asks Taṇḍu to teach the *tāṇḍava* form of dance to Bharata to be used properly in the *pūrvaraṅga*.[116] Pārvatī illustrates the graceful or *sukumāra* form of dance. The myth of the destruction of *Dakṣayajña* is also referred to.[117]

Although iconographic representations of the gods are not referred to, characteristic symbolizations in dance for their worship are known as *piṇḍīs*.[118] We hear of the *piṇḍīs* or worshipful dance-symbols of Śiva in the form of the *liṅga*, of Nandī in the form of the Trident, of Caṇḍikā in the form of *Siṁhāvāhinī*, of Viṣṇu in the form of Garuḍa, of Brahmā in the form of the lotus, and of Indra in the form of the elephant Airāvata. *Kāma*, the lord of love, has fish as his dance sym-

bol *(piṇḍī)*, Kumāra has the peacock, Lakṣmī has form *(rūpa)*, Gaṅgā has *dhārā* or the stream, Yama has the noose, Varuṇa a river, Kuvera a yakṣī, Balarāma a plough, the nāgas a snake and Rudra, the lord of the *gaṇas* and destroyer of the Dakṣa sacrifice, the Trident. Abhinava explains that the gods were to be pleased by the performance of a suitable dance.[119] For each god one would exhibit a characteristic dance figure or movement which would relate to his or her weapon *(āyudha)*, vehicle *(vāhana)*, deed *(karma)* or attitude *(bhāva)*. Thus the *karaṇa* called *Talapuṣpapuṭa* could be used to please the goddess, *Garuḍaplutaka* could indicate the Garuḍa, *Gaṅgāvataraṇa* for the Dhārāpiṇḍī etc. Bharata says that the *piṇḍībandhas* were to be used as flags or emblems. This also confirms that the representation of gods was still primarily symbolic, not iconographic.

The gods and their emblems are mentioned in the context of their contributions to the sages who performed the *nāṭya*.[120] Indra gave his standard *(dhvaja)* which was his popular emblem. Brahmā gave his crooked staff *(kuṭilaka)* which was adopted by the jester *(Vidūṣaka)*. This connection between Brahmā and the Brāhmaṇa jester is not without significance. Varuṇa gave his pitcher *(bhṛṅgāra)* which was adopted by the pāripārśvikas, the companions of the *Sūtradhāra*. The Sun gave the umbrella which was a royal insignia, Śiva success, Vāyu the fan, Viṣṇu the lion-seat, Kuvera the ocean and Sarasvatī the quality of proper audition.[121]

The gods are mentioned again as the protectors of the theatre in its different parts and aspects.[122] The moon god protected the pavilion *(maṇḍapa)*. The Lokapālas protected the theatre in the quarters, the Maruts took care of the intermediate quarters, Mitra of the green room, Varuṇa of the sky, Fire of the *vedikā*, and all the gods of the orchestra *(bhāṇḍa)*. The four orders (varṇas) were appointed to the pillars, the Ādityas and the Rudras were placed between the pillars, the bhūtas in the *dhāraṇīs*, the *apsarās* in the halls, the Yakṣiṇīs in all the rooms and the ocean to the floor. The Destroyer *(Kṛtānta)* and Time were appointed to the gateways, the Chief Nāgas were put on the doors, the staff of Yama on the threshold of the door and Fate and Death were made the gatemen. Indra himself stood by the side of the stage, Lightening was placed on the *Mattavāraṇī*, while Brahmā was positioned on the stage itself. The allocations of gods to parts of the theatre for its protection is reminiscent of the later Tāntric practice of *nyāsa*. Whether any particular significance attaches to specific locations is hard to tell. Probably it represents only an imaginative effort to connect the gods with the theatre and invoke them for safety. It may be recalled that in the *śilpaśāstras* gods were similarly connec-

ted with the different squares of the plans for cities and buildings.[123]

Apart from the various picturesque gods mentioned above, the formless Oṅkāra is also referred to.[124] Indra was to protect the hero, Sarasvatī the heroine, Oṅkāra the jester and Śiva the other characters. Here, again, the jester is seen to be a key character and connected most closely with the primeval creative force itself.

When all the gods are to be recalled for obeisance, the list goes thus—Mahādeva, Pitāmaha, Viṣṇu, Indra, Guha or Kārtikeya, Sarasvatī, Lakṣmī, Siddhi, Medhā, Dhṛti, Smṛti, Soma, Sūrya, Maruts, Lokapālas, Aśvins, Mitra, Agni, Svars(?), Varṇas, Rudra, Kāla, Kali, Mṛtyu, Niyati, Kāladaṇḍa, Viṣṇupraharaṇa *(cakra)*, Vāsuki, Vajra, Vidyut, Samudras, gandharvāpsarās, munis, bhūtas, piśācas, yakśas, guhyakas, maheśvaras, asuras, nāṭya-vighnas, daityarākṣasas, nāṭyakumārīs, mahāgrāmaṇī and others. Here old Vedic gods, popular deities and spirits are all mentioned together in a remarkably eclectic spirit. The reference to nāṭyakumārīs and mahāgrāmaṇīs is intriguing because they are not mentioned elsewhere.[115] Mahāgrāmaṇīs might be the equivalent of grāmadevatās. After the initial obeisance in a comprehensive manner worship proceeded in the early morning invoking the gods, and by utilizing the following substances—red bangles made of thread, red sandalwood, red flowers, red fruits, barley, uncrushed or parched rice grains, the powder of *nāgapuṣpa* and unhusked *priyaṅgu*. With these substances the places for the gods were to be drawn in a *maṇḍala* on the stage itself.[126] Brahmā was to be placed in the centre. To his east were to be placed Śiva, Nārāyaṇa, Skanda, Sūrya, Aśvins, Moon, Sarasvatī, Lakṣmī, Śraddhā and Medhā. To the south-east were to be Fire and Svāhā, Viśvedevāḥ, gandharvas, Rudras and nāgas, to the south Yama, Mitra, pitṛs, piśācas, Nāgas and guhyakas, to the south-west rākṣasas and bhūtas, to the west ocean and Varuṇa, to the north-west the seven Vāyus alongwith Garuḍa and the birds, to the north Kuvera, the nāṭyamātṛs, yakṣas and the guhyakas, to the north-east the gaṇeśvaras like Nandī etc. From this description it emerges that the *maṇḍala* for worship was to be in the form of a lotus with nine petals *(navapadmamaṇḍala)*.[127] The actual placement or invocation was to be by meditation. Then suitable offerings of flowers, food and drink were to be made to them.[128] The gods were to be offered white garlands and sandal paste, the gandharvas, Fire and the Sun were to be offered red garlands and paste. Brahmā was to be offered *madhuparka* or the honey mixture. Sarasvatī milk pudding *(pāyasa)*, Śiva, Viṣṇu, Mahendra etc., *modakas*; Fire, Sun and Moon rice cooked in *ghee* (clarified butter), Viśvedevāḥ with the gandharvas rice cooked with *guḍa*, the sages

honey, milk and rice, Yama and Mitra *apūpas* and *modakas*, *pitṛs* and piśācas milk and *ghee*, fried food, meat, fermented and unfermented drinks and bhūtasaṅghas *caṇakas*. The dānavas were to be offered meat and liquor, the other gods rice with condiments, Varuṇa fish and *piṣṭabhakṣya*, Vāyu diverse *bhakṣya*, nāṭya-matṛs and Kuvera *apūpa*, parched rice and *bhakṣya*.

After this the different gods were to be addressed by different *mantras* or versified formulae and offerings made to them. For example, for Brahmā the verse to be uttered is *Devadeva Mahābhāga Sarvalokapitāmaha/mantraputam imaṁ sarvaṁ pratigṛhṇīṣva me balim//*[129] Śiva was to be addressed as *Devadeva Mahādeva Gaṇeśa Tripurāntaka.*[130] Viṣṇu as *Nārāyaṇāmitagate Padmanābhasurottama.*[131] Sarasvatī is to be addressed as Haripriyā. In several of these formulae the offering is said to be prompted by devotion or *bhakti—Bhaktyā mayodyato deva baliḥ sampratigṛhyatām.*[132] After this, a pot filled with water and decorated with flower garlands with a piece of gold was to be placed in the centre of the stage.[133] The *jarjara* was to be worshipped for the destruction of obstructions. The king and the dancers were to be illuminated by lights and sprinkled with water purified by *mantras* and benediction expressed for them and for the theatre.[134]

It would be clear from this that religion for the *NŚ* means largely popular ritual and myth, to which it added its own quota of ritual and mythic representations. It did not regard tranquillity *(śama)* or devotion *(bhakti)* as capable of being treated as *rasas*. The drama consequently remained essentially secular. All religious elements in it are treated as elements only in entertainment. However, while popular religion is only an entertaining spectacle, in the *NŚ* it does have a more serious and philosophical vision which may be said to reflect the prevailing philosophy of life of its time. The basic principle which is held to govern the vicissitudes of one's life is that of *karman.*[135] A man's fortunes depend ultimately on the moral quality of his deeds and it is this underlying law which the dramatic production seeks to bring out. A strict causal process governs human actors and experiences.[136] It is based on character and circumstances. The former represents the man himself as he has made himself by his own past actions. Circumstances do not remain the same and show surprising ups and downs. It is the mark of a heroic character to face them undeterred when they are adverse. A spirit of idealism pervades the *NŚ* in its conception of heroes and heroines. The villains are ultimately not allowed to succeed.

Philosophically, the point of view is one of reconciliation with the cosmos and society and is in sharp contrast with that of ancient

Greece or some modern western drama. Greek or Elizabethan tragedy depicts a cosmos which is blind or hostile to human fate.[137] Noble characters prove to have devastating infirmities, circumstances make for the inexorable destruction of human personality; a sense of waste and pity pervades the whole. Similarly the old Attic Comedy is primarily satirical and exposes social evil pitilessly.[138] The spirit of the *NŚ*, however, is different. The cosmos is accepted as torn by the strife between Light and Darkness, which is paralleled by the struggle of Right and Wrong in human society. However, it is man's duty to side with the Light and Right and there is no reason for him to be pessimistic. Ultimate victory is bound to be with Truth. Drama should not make out particular episodes of failure and sorrow as ultimate. Similarly, although social evil may be satirized and made fun of, it should not make the social order itself appear ridiculous and thus erode established social values.[139]

A most important aspect of the *NŚ* is the classic tableau which it has created of social values and ideals in the form of recognised dramatic sentiments, characters and themes. This constitutes a lasting and influential formulation of social attitudes and sentiments for Indian literature and cultured society. Of the four Puruṣārthas the first three, generally called the Trivarga, are accepted in the *NŚ* as the basis of human adversity relevant to the production and enjoyment of its spectacle. The *vīra*, *raudra* and *śṛṅgāra* have been connected with *dharma*, *artha* and *kāma* respectively.[140] There is no mention of *mokṣa* or of the *śānta rasa* with which it could be connected. Similarly *bhakti* has not yet been recognised as a major or significant sentiment. Indeed the two principal values and sentiments recognised are heroism and romance. Heroism had been connected with strife, fighting, bravery and prowess but came to be connected more with the inner qualities of enthusiasm and nobility in character.[141] Determination of the objective without confusion or passion, right policy, power, capacity, image and influence were recognised as its distinctive expression.[142] It was associated with tbe feelings of constancy, self-esteem, excitement, force, indignation etc. Abhinavagupta explains that it is the rational determination of the object of enthusiasm and energy which distinguishes heroism from all other kinds of natural enthusiasm.[143] Heroism belonged to the fearlessly, righteous person. Although the king was expected to exemplify it ideally, even the high officials and traders were accepted as fit subjects of heroic conduct although it was not conceived in terms of war and fighting. They were expected to be *dhīra*, endowed with nobility and fortitude. Later theory conceived the *vīra* in a wide variety of situations other

than those of war and politics also.[144]

Unlike martial heroism, love and romance were conceived as universally available values. Characters of all the the three grades, high, middle and low, pursued the third Puruṣārtha.[145] All mental states ultimately arise from *kāma* in the sense of desire *(icchā)*. This desire could be for *dharma, artha* or *mokṣa*, but *kāma* proper is the mutual desire among the sexes.[146] This sexual love is seen universally and is the cause of happiness and unhappiness. It is indeed welcomed as pleasure even when it leads to trouble : "*Sarvasyaiya tu lokasya sukhaduḥkhanibarhaṇaḥ/Bhūyıṣṭhaṁ dṛśyate kāmaḥ sa sukham vyasaneṣvapi//*"[147] It is this love between the sexes when expressed in appropriate emotionally sensitive behaviour and pertaining to superior characters that is called *śṛṅgāra* or the romantic sentiment.—*Yaḥ strīpuṁsasaṁyogo ratisambhogakārakaḥ/Sa śṛṅgāra iti jñeyaḥ upacārakṛtaḥśubhaḥ//*[148] Abhinava explains "*upacāro'nyonya-hṛdayagrahaṇocitair vyāpāraiḥ paripūrṇaḥ. Iha cottamaprakṛtir yadi bhavati tadrasādhyāyoktadṛśā śṛṅgāra ityucyate.*"[149] In the chapter on *rasa*, it is explained that śṛṅgāra arises from the basic feeling, *sthāyibhāva*, of *rati* which is love between high-minded youthful persons of opposite sexes *(uttama-yuvaprakṛtiḥ)*.[150] Abhinava comments that youthfulness refers to the consciousness, not the body.[151] The essence of *śṛṅgāra* is the consciousness of union—*aviyuktasaṁvitprāṇastu śṛṅgāraḥ*.[152]

Ten stages of love were recognised.[153] The first is desire *(abhilāṣā)*, the second thinking of the object of love *(cintana)*, the third remembrance *(anusmṛti)*, the fourth reciting the praises of the object of love *(guṇakīrtana)*, the fifth anxiety and distress *(udvega)*, the sixth lamentation *(vilāpa)*, the seventh intoxication *(unmāda)*, the eighth illness *(vyādhi)*, the ninth dullness *(jaḍatā)* and the tenth death *(maraṇa)*.

Again, eight types of heroines have been described[154]—waiting for the lover, pining in separation, in full command of the lover, estranged by a quarrel, wronged by the infidelity of the lover, neglected after an appointment, one whose lover has gone abroad, one who goes to meet the lover on a rendezvous.

From this brief account of what may be called the 'phenomenology' of love, it would be clear that the conception of love is idealistic in the sense that it places high value on fidelity and constancy in love but it is naturalistic and humanistic in the sense that ıt accepts the natural relation of the sexes as an eminently good thing. It is untinged by any trace of the ascetic disparagement of women, love or enjoyment. At the same time it recognises the vast variety and gradation of love in which numerous types of heroes and heroines participate in various stages and levels. The psychological nature of love is empha-

sized more than the merely physical one. Above all, social proprieties and institutions are given due respect. There is no attempt to appreciate or recognise love out of wedlock. On the other hand, high praise is bestowed on the good wife. She is loved because she is devoted to gods and friends, affectionate towards relations and kinsmen and fond of liberality.[155] Nevertheless, the focus of romantic sentiment rests on youthful love. The very constitution *(sattva)* of the superior maiden love manifests itself in multifarious graces and procedures, beauty and charm.[156] These in turn produce admiration, fascination, yearning, striving, union, separation, and all the diverse stages of romantic experience in a variety of relationship and stages. This course of love is not merely an ideal psychological history but also a pattern which may be legitimately and properly followed.

But romance was not connected only with heroic enterprize, risky conflicts and dangerous complications of suffering intoxication and even death. It was also visualized in the context of playfulness, wit and humour. The *NŚ* closely associates *śṛṅgāra* and *hāsya.*[157] This association could function at various levels of sophistication. The various *lāsyāṅgas* and *vīthyaṅgas* illustrate the diverse types of situations which could develop. The *aṅgas* like *trimūḍhaka* and *Dvimūḍhaka*, for example, not only show amusing but ironical situations.

Heroism emphasized nobility, bravery and duty. Romance emphasized enjoyment, amusement, wit and humour. These were accepted by the *NŚ* without reservation as constituting the prime patterns of social behaviour which it could represent and idealize. Undiluted pity, fear and laughter as occur in pure tragedies or comedies were, however, regarded as essentially of minor significance for the cultured and mature populace.[158] This represents a strikingly distinctive value attitude differentiating it from Greek theatre and social outlook. Abhinava clearly distinguishes popular entertainment *(rañjaka rasa)* from aesthetic enjoyment. It is true, of course, that in the absence of the survival of definitely pre-Bharatan drama, it is difficult to judge how far Abhinava's opinion reflects earlier opinion. Nevertheless, the fact that Bharata makes the *Nāṭaka* and the *Prakaraṇa* central and lets *Aṅka* and *Prahasana* remain only one-act plays does suggest that the latter group was regarded by him as essentially marginal. The later history of drama in any case bears out that the opinion of Abhinavagupta did reflect the critical outlook which came to prevail.

Apart from the government, the family and the diverse professions specializing in arts and crafts and basic economic activities like farming, animal husbandry and trade, education was, as befits a cultured society, a highly organized and valued institution. It rested not on

the impersonal provision of discretionary facilities by the state or private patrons but on the personal context of the teacher and the taught regulated by age-old norms. This system obtained not only for Vedic study and other literature but also for the diverse practical arts and crafts.[159] The teacher was to be addressed in a respectful manner even by the king. For the teacher of drama six qualities have been mentioned viz. knowledge of singing, dancing and instrumental music, the knowledge of rhythm and steps, and the ability to train the student. If the teacher was expected to have six qualities, the student was required to have the following nine qualities viz. *ūhāpoha*, *mati*, *smṛti*, *medhā*, *rāga*, *saṅgharṣa* and *utsāha*.[160] *Ūha* meant the ability to think out what had not been explicitly said, while *apoha* meant the ability to work out the implications of what had been said.[161] *Mati* is talent , *smṛti* memory, *madhā* retention, *rāga* or *guṇa-ślāghā-rāga* the love of excellence and celebrity from which arises competitive keenness, and *utsāha* enthusiasm and energy. Of the branches of literary study we hear of the Vedas, grammar and phonetics, prosody and poetry. The study of Ānvīkṣikī may be presumed from the reference to the *Pramāṇas*.[162a] Adhyātmavidyā is implicitly referred to.[162b] These were, it may be recalled, the two ancient divisions of philosophical study.[163] Gāndharvaveda is referred to in the musical chapters. The chapters on arms-training apparently imply the Dhanurveda. Practical arts are called śilpa and kalā while theoretical disciplines are calld vidyā and jñāna. Arthaśāstra and Nītiśāstra are directly mentioned while Dharmaśāstra and Kāmaśāstra are implied.

Briefly, then, society or *loka* is conceived as a moral order at once human and cosmic in which nature or *svabhāva* is regulated by revealed and immemorial ideal norms. Men are ranked as high, middling and low on the basis of character, caste, social position and profession. The superior person is held to set a standard for the rest. A secular and humanistic outlook pervades social life although a picturesque religion of diverse gods, rituals and superstitions serves as a background. Asceticism and devotionalism play only an extremely limited part. Activity motivated by duty, gain and romantic desire is held to be the stuff of social life. While tradition is respected, innovation is valued. Adventure is at a premium. Kings, priests, ministers and traders are the most prominent classes. There is a vast and complex palace life. Slaves are known, but slavery is a minor feature. Nor is there any evidence of feudal hierarchy. Trade and urban life are prominent. Numerous skilled professions can be seen flourishing.

It can also be seen from the emergence of a new style of music and

the new emphasis now placed in some forms of drama that a parceptible change is gradually coming over society, which would be perfected in the classical Gupta age.

Footnotes

1 G.M. Trevelyan, *Illustrated English Social History*, Pelican, 1960, Vol. I, p. 12.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 13.

3 *NŚ*, chap. I. In *NŚ* IV. 10 the substance of *nāṭya* is thus summarized—
Rasā bhāvā hyabhinayā dharmī vṛttipravṛttayaḥ|
Siddhiḥ svarāstathātodyam gānaṁ raṅgas' ca saṅgrahaḥ||
The element of representation is part of *abhinaya* and *lokadharmī*. But *rasa* is described as the *sine qua non* of the entire dramatic enterprise—*Na hi rasādṛte kaścid arthaḥ pravartate.*—*NŚ* Vol. I, p. 272.

4 *NŚ*, 13. 70-86.

5 *Ibid.*, 13. 71-72. Abhinava explains—*Yadā kavir yathā-vṛttavastumātraṁ varṇayati naṭaśca prayuṅkte na tu svabuddhikṛtam rañjanāvaicitryaṁ tadā tāvān sa kāvyabhāgaḥ prayogabhāgaśca lokadharmāśrayaḥ tatra dharmī.* (*AB*, II, p. 215). *Lokadharmī* follows the facts as given and does not introduce innovative and entertaining variations. Drama and poetry may indeed follow eiher social reality or imagination—*Kāvyanāṭyayorhi lokānusāritvaṁ vā vaicitryayogitvaṁ vā dharmaḥ.* (*Ibid.*, *l.c.*).

6 '*Vārtā*' usually has two meanings viz, livelihood and news or social currency. Cf. *Amarakośa*, 1. 6. 7; 2. 9. 1; 3. 3. 75. (*vārtā vṛttau janaśrutau*). Here as Abhinava says—*lokavārtā lokaprasiddhiḥ.* —*AB*, II, p. 214).

7 In the language of Yoga, *karman*, *vipāka* and *āśaya* are specific.

8 This is the implication of the doctrine of *svadharma*. Cf. the remarks of fisherman in *Śākuntala*, in the *Viṣkambhaka* between the 5th and 6th Acts.

9 Cf. *Manusmṛti*, 2.2-5; Kullūka on *Ibid.*, 2.5—*Nātrecchā niṣidhyate kintu śāstrokta-karmasu samyag vṛttir vidhīyate.*

10 According to the *BG* social relations are based on nature and functions—*Cāturvarṇyaṁ mayā sṛṣṭaṁ guṇakarmavibhāgaśaḥ.*

11 The *Purāṇas* recognise the distinctive feature of India to be *Cāturvarṇya.* Cf. *Vāyu* 45. 82-86; *Matsya*, 114. 5-7; *Mārkaṇḍeya*, 56. 1-2. That is why Bhārata is said to be *karmabhūmi*—*NŚ*, 18. 100.

12 The timelessness is with respect to ordinary empirical history. The cosmic history of the *yugas* does transform human nature and

dharma.—*NŚ*, 1.8.

13 Cf. F.W. Maitland (tr.), *Gierke's Political Theories of the Middle Age*, pp. 7-8.

14 Cf. *AB*, Vol. III, p. 213—*Yadyapi laukikadharmavyatirekeṇa nāṭye na kaściddharmosti tathāpi sa yatra lokagataprakriyākramo rañjanādhikyaprādhānyaṁ adhirohayituṁ kavinaṭavyāpāre vaicitryaṁ svīkurvan nāṭyadharmītyucyate.* Although there is nothing in drama which lies outside social reality, nevertheless imaginative variations introduced for the purpose of entertainment constitute *nāṭyadharmī.*

15 *Ativākyakriyopetamatisattvātibhāvakam/*
līlāṅgahārābhinayaṁ nāṭyalakṣaṇa-lakṣitam//
Svarālaṅkārasaṁyuktamasvastha-puruṣāśrayam/
yadīdṛśam bhavennāṭyaṁ nāṭydharmī tu sā smṛtā//
—*NŚ*, 13. 73-74.

Abhinava explains *ativākyakriyā* to mean an incident invented by the dramatist. *Atisattvātibhāvakam* is explained to refer to extraordinary modes of action and speech.
Śailayānavimānāni carmavarmāyudhadhvajāḥ/
Mūrtimantaḥ prayujyante nāṭydharmī tu sā smṛtā//
—*Ibid.*, 13. 77.

16 *NŚ*, 21. 203 : *Svabhāvo lokadharmī tu vibhāvo nāṭyaṁ eva hi.*

17 The *vibhāvas* are regarded as *alaukika.*

18 Brāhmaṇical works on law used only the criteria of *varṇa* and *jāti*, but Buddhist works refer to *varṇa, jāti* and *śilpa*; see G.C. Pande, *Foundations of Indian Culture*, Vol. II. The introduction of *prakṛti* as a major criterion is peculiar to the *NŚ* but corresponds to the use of 'high' and 'low' in common usage with reference to quality of character.

19 The *Pañcatantra* gives expression to the social recognition of wealth—The superiority of the Kṣatriyas was upheld by the Buddhists and even the *BG* exalts the king over other men.

20 *NŚ*, 24. 1.

21 *Jitendriya-jñānavatī nānāśilpavicakṣaṇā/*
Dakṣiṇādhamahālakṣyā bhītānāṁ parisāntvanī//
Nānāśāstrārthasampannā gāmbhīryaudaryaśālinī/
Sthairvatyāgaguṇopetā jñeyā prakṛtiruttamā//
—*Ibid.*, 24. 2-3.

22 *Lokopacāra-caturā śilpaśāstra-viśāradā/*
Vijñāna-mādhyryayutā madhyamā prakṛtiḥ smṛta//
—*Ibid.*, 24. 4.

23 *Rūksavāco'tha duḥśīlāḥ kusattvāḥ sthūla-buddhayaḥ/*
Krodhanā ghātakāścaiva mitraghāśchidra-māninaḥ//

piśunāstūddhatair vākyair akṛtajñāstathālasāḥ/
mānyāmānyā-viśeṣajñāḥ strīlolāḥ kalahapriyāḥ//
Sūcakāḥ pāpakarmāṇaḥ paradāravyapahāriṇaḥ/
ebhir doṣaistu sampannā bhavantīhādhamā narāḥ//
—*Ibid.*, 24. 5-7.

24 *NŚ*, 24. 15 : *vidhānam śīlasamāśrayam. Ibid.*, 24. 8 : *Evam tu śīlato nṛṇām prākṛtistrividhā smṛtā.*

25 *Mṛdubhāvā cācapalā smitbhāṣinyaniṣṭhurā/*
gurūṇāṁ vacane dakṣā salajjā vinayānvitā//
Rūpābhijana-mādhuryair guṇaiḥ svābhāvikair yutā/
gāmbhiryadhairya-sampannā vijñeyā pramadottamā//
—*Ibid.*, 24. 9-10.

26 *Nāṭyukṛṣṭair anikhilair ebiḥ evānvitā guṇaiḥ/*
alpadoṣānuviddhā ca madhyamā prakṛtiḥ smṛtā//
Adhamā prakṛtir vā tu puruṣāṇāṁ prakīrtitā/
Vijñeyā saiva nārīṇām adhamānām samāsataḥ//
—*Ibid.*, 24. 11-12.

27 *Ibid.*, 24. 17.

28 *Ibid.*, 24. 18-19.

29 This is the interpretation which Abhinava puts on these statements of Bharata. See *AB*, Vol. II, p. 414.

30 *NŚ*, 18. 48—*Vipravaṇiksacivānāṁ purohitāmātyasārthavāhānām/*

31 *Devānāmasurāṇām rājñaṁ atha kuṭumbinām/*
Brahmaṛṣiṇāṁ ca vijñeyaṁ nāṭyam vṛttāntadarśakam//
—*Ibid.*, 1. 118.

32 References to them are scattered. Eg. *NŚ*, 24. 13-14; *Ibid.*, 12. 127ff.

33 *NŚ*, 19. 82; *Ibid.*, 1. 86.

34 R.C. Hazra has traced the *Vidūṣaka* to the Vedic age. See his '*The Professional Jester in the Vedic Age*', *IHQ*, 1962.

35 Cf. Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali Age.*

36 Cf. Shastri, *The Age of the Nandas* and *Mauryas*; R.K. Mookerji, *Chandragupta Maurya and His Times.*

37 *Manusmṛti*, Chap. X on Varṇasaṅkaras and Vrātyas.

38 Cf. *NŚ*, 12. 150; *Śakāra* appears to be derived from *Śaka*, *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, 4. 1. 130. It has been used in its derivation in the *Kāśikā;* cf. *AB*, Vol. II, pp. 161-62 : *Śakārabahulā yasya bhāṣā sa Śakāraḥ. Śakāropalakṣita-Śakādijanapadavāsītyanye. Hīnasya uttamapade'-bhiropitaḥ Śakāra ityanye.*

39 Cf. Fick, *Social Organisation in North-Eastern India in the Time of Buddha*, p. 252; G.C. Pande, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 213.

40 E.g. *Vinaya* quoted by G.C. Pande, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 242. D.C.

Sircar, *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I.

41 Cf. *Arthaśāstra*, 1. 3. 7. *Vaiśyasyādhyayanaṁ yajanaṁ dānaṁ kṛṣi-pāśupālye vaṇijyā ca*; *Manusmṛti*, 1. 90; 10, 79. It may be noted that Manu has added money-lending.

42 Cf. *NŚ*, 12. 110-11; *Kāmasūtra*, 1.4.32 : *bhuktavibhavastu............ guṇavān viṭaḥ*. Cf. *ibid*., 1.5 for *viṭa* and *vidūṣaka* as *nāgarakas*.

43 *NŚ*, 2. 49-50, 52.

44 *Ibid*., 2. 46-55; 21. 113.

45 *Ibid*., 37. 38-40.

46 *Manusmṛti*, Chap. X.

47 *NŚ*, 21. 108-09.

48 *Ibid*., 21. 110.

49 *Ibid*., 1. 118.

50 *Ibid*., 19. 148.

51 *Ibid*., 24. 74.

52 *AB*, III, p. 259 : *yuvarājo'tra rājaśabdenoktaḥ*.

53 *NŚ*, 24. 76-79. The *rājā* is described as *arthaśāstravit*, *nītiśāstrārthakuśalaḥ* and *dharmajñaḥ*.

54 *AB*, Vol. III, p. 260 : *anurāgavān iti prajāsu prajāsvayatnānuraktaḥ anurāgo hi sārvaguṇyam iti Kauṭalyaḥ*.

55 *Kulīnā buddhisampannā nānāśāstravipāścitaḥ/*
Snigdhāḥ parairahāryāśca na pramattāśca deśajāḥ//
Alubdhāśca vinītāśca śucayo dhārmikāstathā/

—*NŚ*, 24. 80-81.

It may be noted that the primary emphasis here is on high birth, loyalty, integrity and the knowledge of the *śāstras*.

56 *Pararandhra-vidhijñāśca yatrakālaviśeṣavit/*
Arthaśāstrārthakuśalo hyanuraktaḥ kulodbhavaḥ//

—*Ibid*., 24. 82-83.

57 *Madhyasthā dhārmikā dhīrāḥ kāryākaryavivekinaḥ/*
Snigdhāḥ śāntā vinītāśca mādhyasthā nipuṇāstathā/
Nayajñā vinayajñāśca ūhāpohavicakṣaṇāḥ//

—*Ibid*., 24. 84-87.

Abhinava says, *Prāḍvīvāka it pṛcchati vivādapade nirṇayamiti...... prajānām mātsyanyāyaśca vivādanirṇayeṇa rakṣyate. Tatra ca prāḍvivāka eva pradhānam. Tathā ca prāḍvivāko rājasthānīya iti loke prasiddham.*

—*AB*, III, pp. 261-62.

Prāḍvivāka questions and gives decisions in legal disputes. It is the duty of the king to protect the people from anarchy (*mātsya-nyāya*). In the performance of this duty, the Prāḍvivāka plays a pre-eminent part. Hence he is popularly known as the king's

deputy. Abhinava also explains *Naya* as Arthaśāstra and *Vinaya* as Dharmaśāstra. *l.c.*

58 *NŚ*, 24. 88-89.

59 *AB*, III, p. 262,

60 *NŚ*, 21. 148. Cf. *Arthaśāstra*, 2. 4. 5.

61 *NŚ*, 21. 149.

62 *NŚ*, 27. 64-67; *Ibid.*, 24. 64 refers to āyuktikā which suggests the existence of āyuktakas. Āyukta is used for an officer in the *Arthaśāstra*—1.15. 10; 13. 2.6-20.

63 *NŚ*, 27. 64-65.

64 *Ibid.*, 17. 53-57.

65 *Ibid.*, 21. 214 mentions *ayas* (iron) and *tamrapaṭṭa* (copper plates), *abhraka* (mica) and *vaṅga* (tin or lead).

66 *Ibid.*, 23. 9-10.

67 *Ibid.*, 24. 30ff.

68 Yaśodhara in his commentary on the *Kāmasūtras* (1.3.15) lists the 64 *kalās*. These include singing, dancing, instrumental music, knowledge of scripts, eloquence, painting, modelling, leaf-cutting, garland-making, tasting, examination of gems, serving, stage-craft, instrumentation *(upakaraṇa-kriyā)*, weights and measures, science of livelihood, veterinary sciences *(tiryagyonicikitsitam)*, hypocritical or deceitful knowledge of heterodox sects, skill in games, *vaicakṣaṇya*, massage, bodily decoration, *viśeṣakauśala* and twenty arts connected with erotic enterprize. The list in the *Kāmasūtras (l.c.)* is similar in many respects. It adds perfumes, jugglery, sleight of hand, preparation of strange dishes, mixing of drinks, riddles, reading of books, theatrical and literary arts, textiles, carpentry, architecture, examination of coins, metallurgy, knowledge of precious stones, science of the health of trees, fighting of rams, cocks, etc., training birds to sing, knowledge of dialects, of omens, mechanics *(yantramātṛkā)*, metrics and athletics. These lists include industrial and fine arts along with minor decorative arts, games and erotic arts. The last ones include the arts of the professional hetairae catering for their royal and bourgeois patrons.

69 *NŚ*, 23. 53-58.

70 *Ibid.*, 24. 58-59.

71 *Ibid.*, 24. 59-60.

72 *Ibid.*, 24. 62ff.

73 Cf. S.P. Tiwari, *Royal Attendants in Ancient Indian Literature, Epigraphy and Art*, pp. 30ff., 77ff.

74 *Mahādevī tathā devyaḥ svāminyaḥ sthāpitā api/*
Bhoginyaḥ śilpakāriṇyo nāṭakīyāḥ sanartakāḥ//

Anucārikāśca vijñeyāstathā ca paricārikāḥ/
Tathā sañcārikāścaiva tathā preṣaṇakārikāḥ//
Mahattaryaḥ pratihāryaḥ kumāryaḥ sthavirāpi/
Āuyktikāśca nṛpaterayam antaḥpuro janaḥ//
—*NŚ*, 24. 30-32.

Abhinava adds—*Mahādeviprabhṛtyāvuktikāntaḥ saptadaśakaḥ strī-gaṇaḥ napuṁsaka-vargo'ṣṭādaśa.* (*AB*, III, p. 252).

75 *NŚ*, 17. 66ff.

76 *Ibid.*, 17. 70—*yasmāt pūjyā dvijāḥ smṛtāḥ.*

77 *Deveti nṛpatirvācyo bhṛtyaiḥ prakṛtibhiḥ tathā/*
Bhaṭṭeti sārvabhaumastu nityaṁ parijanena tu// —*Ibid.*, 17. 80.

78 *Ibid.*, 17. 91.

79 *Ibid.*, 17. 28-30.

80 *Jātibhāṣāśrayaṁ pāṭhyaṁ dvividhaṁ samudāhṛtam//*
Prākṛtaṁ Saṁskṛtaṁ caiva cāturvarṇyasamāśrayam/
—*Ibid.*, 17. 31-32.

81 *Dāridryādhyayanābhāvayadṛcchādibhireva ca/*
Aiśaryeṇa pramattānām dāridryeṇa plutātmanām//
Anadhītottāmānāṁ ca Saṁskṛtaṁ na prayojayet/
--*Ibid.*, 17. 34-35.

82 *Ibid.*, 17. 39. *Śilpakāryāstathaiva ca.*

83 *Ibid.*, 17. 49-50.

84 *Ibid.*, 21. 113.

85 *Ibid.*, 21. 115-20.

86 *Ibid.*, 21. 125-27.

87 *Ibid.*, 21. 129. *Śuddharaktavicitrāṇi vāsāṁsyūrdhvāmbarāṇi ca.*

88 *Ibid.*, 21. 134 : *kāṣāyakañcukapaṭāḥ kāryāstepi yathāvidhi.*

89 *Veṣaḥ sāṅgrāmikaścaiva śūrāṇām samprakīrtitaḥ/*
Vicitra-sastra-kavaco baddhatūṇo dhanurdharaḥ//
—*Ibid.*, 21. 135.

90 *Ibid.*, 18. 65ff.

91 *Muditajanapadākulā sphītasasyākarā bhūtadhātrī bhavantam samabhyarcati dvirada-karavilupta-hintāla-tālīvanāstvām namasyanti vindhyādayaḥ parvatāḥ/Sphuṭitakalaśa-śukti-nirgīrṇa-muktā phalairūrmihastairnamasyanti vaḥ sāgarāḥ mudita-jalacarākulāḥ samprakīrṇāmalāḥ kīrtayantīva kīrtim mahānimnagāḥ//*
—*Ibid.*, 15. 154.

92 *Ibid.*, 22. 203.

93 *B.G.*, 3. 21.

94 *NŚ*, 12. 27.

95 *Ibid.*, 12. 28.

96 *Ibid.*, 13. 55. Cf. *Arthaśāstra* 1.15 which speaks of the *mantripari-*

ṣad and of the importance of *deśakālavibhāga*. *Arthayukti* is also spoken of (*Ibid.*, 7. 18. 35; 8. 1. 59).

97 D.C. Sircar, *op. cit.*

98 *Diptarasakāvyayonirnānābhavopasampannaḥ//*
yuddhaniyuddhādharṣaṇa-sampheṭa-kṛtaśca kartavyaḥ//
—*NŚ*. 18. 85-86

So in *Vyāyoga*, but without divine heroes—*Ibid.*, 18. 92-93. *Īhāmṛga* has *divyastrīkāraṇopagatayuddhaḥ* (*Ibid.*, 18. 78). *Samavakāra* has three *vidravas* and three *kapaṭas* (*Ibid.*, 18. 63). The first celestial drama was a representation of the victory of the gods over the *asuras* and it was *sampheṭavidravakṛtacchedyabhedyāhavātmikā* (*Ibid.*, 1. 58).

99 Thus *kapaṭa* was an integral part of *samavakāra* but in the *Nāṭaka*, the hero was to be *udātta* (noble or sublime) (*NŚ*, 18. 10) and of a family of saintly kings (*rājarṣivaṁśa*). Cf. *AB*. Vol. II, p. 412.

100 *NŚ*, 24. 62. *Bhāṇḍāgāreṣvadhikṛtaśca yudhādhikṛtastathā.*

101 *Ibid.*, 12. 89-90, 107-108; *Ibid.*, 21. 206.

102 *Ibid.*, 21. 165-70; *Ibid.*, 9. 58-60; *Ibid.*, 15. 123-24.

103a *Amarakośa* 2.8.93 has *sarvalā tomaro' striyām*. Monier Williams regards *tomara* as a kind of lance or javelin.

103b Cf. G.N. Pant, *Indian Archery*.

104 *Vividhaturaṅganāgaratha-yodhasaṁkulamalaṁ balaṁ samuditaṁ śaraśataśaktikuntaparighāsiyaṣṭivitataṁ bahupraharaṇam/ripuśatamuktaśastraravabhītasaṅkitabhaṭaṁ bhayākuladıśaṁ kṛtamabhivīkṣya saṁyugamukhe samarpitaguṇaṁ tvayāśvalalitam//*
—*NŚ*, 15. 139.

105 *Ibid.*, 10. 5.

106 *Ibid.*, 10. 51.

107 *Ibid.*, 10. 97ff.

108 *Ibid.*, Chap. 11.

109 *Ibid.*, 20. 14, 18-19.

110 *Ibid.*, 21. 9.

111a *NŚ*, 22. 154 seems to refer to the *Narasiṁha* incarnation of Viṣṇu, although it does not use the word *avatāra*.

111b Thus the *raṅgapūjana* in Chap. III is traditionally ritualistic, but the worship in the *Pūrvaraṅga* is through. music, dance and flowers.

112 *NŚ*, 12. 84-86. Here the superior (*uttama*) ascetics are distinguished from the others who are *vibhrānta* such as *Pāśupatas*. The two words used generally are *liṅgin* and *pāṣaṇḍin*. *Ibid.*, 2. 37, 38 :
Utsāryāṇi tvaniṣṭāni pāṣaṇḍyāśramiṇastathā//
Kāṣāyavasanāścaiva vikalāścaiva ye narāḥ/
It may be recalled that Aśoka uses *pāṣaṇḍa* as a word for 'sect'

of which the Greek translation was '*diatribe*' (Romila Thapar, *Aśoka and the Decline of the Mauryas).*

113 *NŚ*, 1. 54. *Ayaṁ dhvajamahaḥ śrīmānmahendrasya pravartate//* *Ibid.*, 1. 56 '*mahendravijayotsave*'.

114 *Ibid.*, Chap. 20.

115 *Ibid.*, Chap. 4.

116 *Ibid.*, 4. 17-18.

117 *Ibid.*, 4. 250.

118 *Ibid.*, 4. 252-59.

119 Cf. *Ya kācid devatetyucyate tasvāḥ paścān nṛttena paritoṣaṇam kāryam. Tan madhye ca tadīyāyudhavāhanakarmabhāvādyanukārī aṅgaprayogo vidheyaḥ.* (*AB*, I, p. 168). *Dhvajabhūtaḥ prayoktavyāḥ piṇḍībandhāḥ sucihnitāḥ/* (*NŚ*, 4. 259).

120 *Ibid.*, 1. 59-61.

121 *Ibid.*, 1. 61. *Śravyatvaṁ prekṣaṇīyasya dadau devī Sarasvatī.*

122 *Ibid.*, 1. 83-98.

123 E.g., *Śilparatnam*, Vol. I, pp. 26-31.

124 *Nāyakaṁ rakṣatīndrastu nāyikām ca Sarasvatī/*
Vıdūṣakamathauṁkāraḥ śeṣāstu prakṛtīrharaḥ//
—*NŚ*, 1. 97.

125 *Ibid.*, 3. 4-9.

126 *Ibid.*, 4. 19-20.

127 *AB*, I, p. 75. *Navapadmamaṇḍalaṁ ityuktaṁ bhavati.*

128 *NŚ*, 4. 35-45.

129 *Ibid.*, 4. 47.

130 *Ibid.*, 4. 48.

131 *Ibid.*, 4. 49.

132 *Ibid.*, 4. 56-57, 59.

133 *Ibid.*, 4. 72.

134 *Ibid.*, 4. 83-85.

135 This follows from the *nāṭya* being the representation of the world and at the same time of *karma* and the states of being (*karmabhāvānvayāpekṣī nāṭyavedo mayā kṛtaḥ—NŚ*, 1. 106).

136 Cf. *NŚ*, 19. 7.

137 Aristotle, *Poetics*; Bradley, *Shakespearean Tragedy.*

138 Aristophanes illustrates this.

139 It is for their ridiculing of society in general and the sages in particular that the Bharatas were condemned to be Śūdras. *NŚ*, 37. 32-40.

140 *AB*, Vol. I, pp. 333, 341; *Ibid.*, II, p. 451.

141 *NŚ*, Vol. I, p. 324. *Atha vīrnāmottamāprakṛtir utsāhātmakaḥ.*

142 *Ibid.*, l.c. *Sa cāsammohādhyavasāya-nayavinayabalaparākramaśakti-*

pratāpaprabhāvādibhir vibhāvairutpadyate. Also Cf. *Ibid.*, 7. 21.

143 *AB*, Vol. I, p. 324. *Tatra sarvo jana utsāhavān eva. Kintvaviṣaya ityanupadeśya-caritatā...... ucitatvam avasarasya asammohādi-sampattiriti saiva vibhāvatvenopadiṣṭa.*

144 Cf. *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, 3. 234, which speaks of four types of *vīra*, viz. *Dānavīra*, *Dharmavīra*, *Yuddhavīra* and *Dayāvīra*.

145 *Iha kāmasamutpattir nānābhāvasamudbhavā/*
Strīṇāṁ va puruṣāṇām vā uttamādhammadhyamā//
—*NŚ*, 22. 157.

146 *Prāyeṇa sarvabhāvānāṁ kāmānniṣpattiriṣyate/*
Sa cecchāguṇasampanno bahudhā parikalpitaḥ//
Dharmakāmo'rtha-kāmaśca mokṣakāmastathaiva ca/
Strīpuṁsayoṣtu yogo yaḥ sa tu kāma iti smṛtaḥ// —*Ibid.*, 22. 95-96.

147 *Ibid.*, 22. 97.

148 *Ibid.*, 22. 98.

149 *AB*, Vol. III, p. 187.

150 *NŚ*, Vol. I, p. 301.

151 *AB*, Vol. I, p. 302. *Tatrottamayuvaśabdena tatsamviducyate na tu kāyaḥ.*

152 *Ibid.*, l.c.

153 *Ibid.*, 22. 158ff. However, Bhaṭṭatauta declared *Kāmāvasthā na śṛṅgāraḥ. Kvacid āsām tadaṅgatā.*—*AB*, Vol. III, p. 199.

154 *Ibid.*, 22. 100ff.

155 *Priyadaivata-mitrāsi priyasambandhibāndhavā/*
priyadānaratā pathyā dayite tvam priyāsi me// —*NŚ*, 15. 163.

156 *NŚ*, 22. 6-11; *Ibid.*, 22. 26-29; *śobhā*, *kānti*, *dīpti* and *mādhurya* are distinguished.

157 *Ibid.*, 6. 39. *Śṛṅgārāddhi bhaved hāsyaḥ.*

158 *AB*, Vol. II, p. 451 : *utsṛṣṭikāṅka-prahasana-bhāṇāstu karuṇa-hāsya-vismaya-pradhānatvād rañjaka-rasa-prādhānāḥ tata evatra strī-bāla-mūrkhādir adhikārī.*

159 The guilds promoted an apprentice system which is not directly referred to in the *NŚ*.

160 *NŚ*, 26. 35-37.

161 Cf. *Amarakośa*, 1.5.70 : '*adhyāharastarka ūhaḥ......*'

162a *NŚ*, 25. 120 : '*Loko vedastathādhyātmaṁ pramāṇaṁ trividhaṁ smṛtam.*'

162b See supra, fn. 95.

163 Cf. Vātsyāyana's *Nyāyabhāṣya* : "*Imās tu catasro vidyāḥ yāsāṁ caturthīyam nyāyavidyā. Tasyāḥ pṛthakprasthānāḥ saṁśayādayaḥ padārthāḥ. Teṣām pṛthag vacanamantareṇādhyāmavidyāmatraṁ iyaṁ syāt yathopaniṣadaḥ.*" (ad. *Nyāyasūtras* 1.1.1.).

Chapter 6

Dance and the Language of Gestures

Concept of Dance

Classical Indian dance has two distinct facets—*nṛtta* and *nṛtya.*

Nṛtta is a pure dance in accordance with rhythm and tempo. The technique of *nṛtta* consists of a series of movements culminating in some characterstic pose or stance or a total impression of a fludity ending in a cadence of momentary motionlessness. The position of the body is fixed with reference to a number of horizontal and vertical axes and the movement of each part of the body is described with reference to these axes. Unlike western classical ballet, which is primarily occupied with the problem of covering space-continuous movement in an endless expanse, Indian dance is confined to a limited location in which movements do not depart from the governing axes. Indians are not so occupied with the problem of space as that of time. The concept of the still point in time—the ultimate in spiritual praxis—is reflected in all the other arts too, which imparts to them an inner or meditative quality. In western music, the concept of harmony is, again, basically that of covering space. In Indian music we have the limited spatial movement, a sequence of notes revolving round the tonic. Similarly, in dance the emphasis is on the pose, the stance. The dancer is constantly preoccupied with capturing the perfect pose which will convey a sense of timelessness. This perfect pose has an almost sculptursque quality. The technique of *nṛtta*, we thus find, is integrally connected with sculpture.

Nṛtya is dance with mime. It can also be called *abhinaya* which is the term popularly used by practising dancers for the mime aspect of dance—*Ṛṣaya ūcuḥ—yadā prāptyarthamarthānāṁ tajjñairabhinayaḥ kṛtaḥ* (*NŚ*, B.H.U. ed., 4.266). It involved gesticulations, facial expressions and acting. The purpose was the enactment of *rasa* by some narrative theme or lyrical literary composition.

In chapter four is raised the question. "What is the purpose of *nṛtta* ? What is its nature ?"—*Kasmānnṛttaṁ kṛtaṁ hyetatkaṁ svabhāvamapekṣate* ? (*NŚ*, 4.266). Dance as an independent performing art is understandable. What is questioned here is its role in drama.

Bharata answers thus—Firstly, to generate splendour and beauty—*kim tu śobhāṁ prajanayediti nṛttaṁ pravartitam* (*ibid.*, 4.268). *Nṛtta*

is dear to the people and also regarded as auspicious--*prāyeṇa sarva lokasya nṛttamiṣṭam svabhāvataḥ/ maṅgalyamiti kṛtvā ca nṛttametat-prakīrtitam // (ibid*, 4.269). Dance is often used in all festive and cultural occasions, hence used here too—*vivāhaprasavāvāha-pramodābhyudayādiṣu / Vinodakāraṇam ceti nṛttametatpravartitam //—(ibid.*, 4.270). It releases one of the tensions and worries that afflict the mind—"*ataścaiva pratikṣepādbhūtasaṁghaiḥ pravartitāḥ / Ye gītakādau yujyante samyagnṛttavibhāgakāḥ // (ibid.*, 4.271). Hence dance is an integral part of drama. In fact, Abhinava says that *nṛtta* is the very essence of the *prastāvanā—nāṭyasya prastāvanāprāṇasya pratibimbakalpaṁ nṛttam (AB* on *NŚ*, 4.268).

Tandava, Lasya and Pindibandha

Three types of dance forms have been described in the *NŚ* viz. *Tāṇḍava, Lāsya* and *Piṇḍībandha.*

Tāṇḍava is the dance taught to Bharata muni by Taṇḍu at the orders of Lord Śiva.[1] It was to be performed during the *pūrvaraṅga*, i.e. the preliminaries of the play. Such a *pūrvaraṅga* was to be called *citra* as contrasted with the *śuddha pūrvaraṅga*, which was to be performed without any dance.[2]

Abhinavagupta describes *tāṇḍava* as *uddhata* and the *sukumāra pūrvaraṅga*, as one with *anuddhata aṅgahāras.*[3] But he does not overemphasize this fact, nor does he term the two forms of *tāṇḍava* and *lāsya* as masculine or feminine like the later texts of medieval times. The *NŚ* uses the word *tāṇḍava* as a generic term. From its description it is clear that *tāṇḍava* did not connote a form of dance that was just vigorous or performed exclusively by men. In fact, Bharata's description of the *tāṇḍava* as performed during the *pūrvaraṅga* definitely has women dancing in it.[4] *Tāṇḍava* was performed during the *pūrvaraṅga*, to be staged alongwith the *devastuti* that was sung[5] and was based on the *vardhamānaka*[6]—a complicated beat-structure of *gāndharva* music. Quoting an authority Abhinava states that *recita aṅgahāras* were greatly used in *tāṇḍava.*[7]

Lāsya was the *sukumāra* or gentle form of dance dominated by *śṛṅgāra rasa.* It was comprised of *lalita karaṇas* and *aṅgahāras* which were graceful and beautiful such as *talapuṣpapuṭa* etc. In chapter 31, Bharata describes the *lakṣaṇas* i.e. characteristics and *prayoga* or use of *lāsya* (*NŚ*, G.O.S. ed., 31. 330). Ten elements of *lāsya* are described.

Geyapada[8]—After the curtain has been drawn, the drums are played and tuned, so also the *vīṇā.* The *geyapada* comprises mainly a song in the form of a dialogue between a male and a female. The song is actually a form of *maṅgala* and comprises primarily *pārameśvara śṛṅgāra.*

Sthitapāṭhya[9]—Abhinava says that this corresponds to the *Nandi*, and in this singing is to be combined with acting and dance.

Āsīnapāṭhya[10]—In this a verse of four *padas* or a *catuṣpada* was to be sung.

Puṣpagaṇḍikā[11]—Abhinava says that *puṣpagaṇḍikā* is so called because it is like the threading of a garland. A line is sung and is illustrated by dancing and enacting which are thus threaded into it. The song has 4 *padas*. *Puṣpagaṇḍikā* is, however, concluded with vigorous *cārī* and *aṅgahāra*.

Pracchedaka[12]—This has three *aṅgas*. The first is called *prakrīḍita*. In this, a song is sung in which a woman, seeing the image of the beloved in moonlight, wine, water or mirror, expresses her joy and dances. Abhinava says that *praccheda* really means *pratibimba* or image. The idea is that the lover is standing beside the beloved, seeking to know her mind. The *nāyikā* sees the reflection and describes the effects of love. Its first part is *prasāda* or the abandoning of pride, *māna-bhaṅga*. The second *aṅga* is *toṭaka*. Abhinava says it has a deep import. The third *aṅga* is *nārācaka*. This is based on *kaiśikī jāti*.

Trimūḍha[13]—Abhinava quotes his teacher to explain the name. Here, three feelings are conjoined—*īrṣyā* or jealousy, *praṇaya-bhaṅga* or disregard of love, and *lajjā* or bashfulness. It consists of soft words and *gāndhārī jāti*. Elaborate *aṅgahāras* are not to be used.

Saindhavaka[14]—This is in the *Saindhavī* language. Abhinava explains that it is devoid of all softness. It is popularly known as spectacles *(prekṣaṇīya)* designated *ḍombikā*, *bījaka prasthāna* etc. (It seems that this was a sort of an *uparūpaka* enacted out in the local Sindhi dialect). Abhinava says that here there is not the slightest *pāṭhya* or recitation (this perhaps must be only song and dance).

Dvimūḍha[15]—Abhinava says that the hero and heroine both are confused here. It is similar to *trimūḍha* except that it is more brief.

Uttamottamaka[16]—In the beginning there is a *narkuta* verse, then a *dvipada* (a *dhruvā* song with two *padas*) which has a *tāla* of 24 *kalās*.

Uktapratyukta[17]—Here there is much dialogue expressing anger and conciliation.

Classical Indian dance has hitherto generally been discussed under the two aspects of *tāṇḍava*[18] and *lāsya*.[19] However, there is a distinct third form viz. *piṇḍībandha* mentioned in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of sage Bharata.

The origin of the *piṇḍībandha* dance form has been described thus in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* : While Lord Śiva and his consort Pārvatī were dancing, the formation of *piṇḍīs* was observed by the troupes of Śiva viz. Nandi, Bhadramukha etc. and they created the *piṇḍīban-*

dhas with their distinct characteristics.[20] Abhinavagupta, the foremost commentator of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, explains *piṇḍībandha* as being created by the simultaneous combination of *asukumāra* (vigorous) and *sukumāra* (gentle) i.e., *tāṇḍava* and *lāsya nṛttas* (dances) respectively.[21]

The term *piṇḍībandha* is explained in the text as *piṇḍīnāṁ bandha* i.e. formation of *piṇḍis*. The fundamental question, therefore, is, what are these *piṇḍīs* ? *Piṇḍīs* are said to represent well-marked emblems (weapons, vehicles, flags etc.) of the various gods.[22] Bharata clearly says that the *piṇḍīs* are named either after the gods themselves or their emblems. He has enumerated the *piṇḍīs* of the different gods.[23]

Abhinavagupta states that *piṇḍībandha* is a complex formation using three elements viz. *ādhāra*, *aṅga* and *prayoga*.[24] The term *ādhāra* would mean basis, i.e. the basis of representation itself. This representation of the emblems of the different deities was apparently done within a framework of cosmic symbolism. Thus, it was limited not only to the emblems, but perhaps also accomponied with the representation of cosmic dimensions of space and time. The emblems served to symbolise the deities, and cosmic space and time imparted a befitting context to them.[25] The latter are therefore known as *ādhāra* or basic constituent and are ten in number. These are as follows—The seven worlds, and time with its three divisions of past, present and future. The medium of representation consists of the seven limbs or *aṅgas* which are enumerated thus—two hands, two feet, two eyes and the head. *Prayoga* or rendering is the third constituent and is of four types. It could be executed by one or many dances, either uniformly or in a diversity of ways.[26]

Now, coming to the point of the rendering itself, the question that arises is, how were these *piṇḍīs* to be actually exhibited in dance ? This is answered by Abhinavagupta. Each god had his *piṇḍī* which was to be formed by making the body take the shape of that *karaṇa*[27] or *aṅgahāra*,[28] that was able, by its name or form to symbolise (by representing the emblem or cosmic symbolism) the deity concerned.[29] For example, the *piṇḍī* of Lord Viṣṇu is Tārkṣya i.e., Garuḍa. Hence this is to be shown by forming the *garuḍa plutaka karaṇa. The piṇḍī* of Jāhnavī or Gaṅgā is *dhārā*, so that is to be displayed by the *gaṅgāvataraṇa karaṇa*. The *sarpa* or snake *piṇḍī* is indicated by the *nāgasarpita karaṇa*. Showing the body like a trident symbolises the *piṇḍī* of Śiva. Similarly *Śikhipiṇḍī* is said to be indicated by *mayūralalita karaṇa. Karaṇas* like *Viṣṇukrāntā*, *cakramaṇḍala* etc. indicate the *piṇḍīs* of Viṣṇu. The *Niśumbhita karaṇa* is said to please Śiva and the *talapuṣpapuṭa karaṇa* is for appeasing Pārvatī.[30]

Four styles of rendering the *piṇḍībandha* dance have been described in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, viz. *Piṇḍī Śṛṅkhalikā, Latābandha* and *Bhedyaka.*[31] Bharata says that from the term *piṇḍī* is derived *piṇḍībandha*, *śṛṅkhalā* betokens a *gulma* or cluster, the *latābandha* suggests a net or *jāla* formation and *bhedyaka* is with dance.[32] Kapila Vatsyayana has connected the *gulma* with the *piṇḍī*. Since *gulma* means a cluster, she has taken the first to denote a collective dance where a closed cluster would be made by the dancers.[33] But a close perusal of the verse in the *NŚ* makes it apparent that *gulma* is connected not with the *piṇḍī* style, but with *śṛṅkhalā*. Abhinavagupta's commentary, too, makes it clear that from *piṇḍī* is derived *piṇḍībandha* and *gulma* or cluster is connected with *śṛṅkhalā*. He also says that the *Piṇḍī*, *Śṛṅkhalikā*, *Latābandha* and *Bhedyaka* were executed by one, two, three, and four dances respectively.[34] Then, again, it may be argued that during the *pūrvaraṅga* or the staging of the preliminaries of a play, the *piṇḍī* style was danced with the *kaniṣṭha āsārita*, and we also know that only one dancer performed this first *āsārita.*[35] How would a cluster formation be possible with one single dancer ?[36]

According to M.M. Ghosa[37] and Kapila Vatsyayana[38] the *śṛṅkhalā* was a chain formation. This can be readily accepted. It makes it easy to understand how the *śṛṅkhalā* would denote a *gulma*. Cluster-dancers holding hands (a chain formation) perhaps form a circle, and such concentric circles give the appearance of a closed cluster. *Latābandha* is the form where the dancers put their arms around each other.[39] Bharata says that it had a *jāla* or net formation. Perhaps the dancers, with arms round each other stood in horizontal rows bisected by vertical rows giving the impression of a net. *Bhedyaka* is the form where group formation is broken up and dancers perform individual movements.[40]

Abhinavagupta has described *sajātīya* or homogeneous and *vijātīya* or heterogeneous dancing of *piṇḍībandha*. Of the four modes of rendering (*prayoga*) the first two, executed by one or many dancers, are clear. The latter two, *sama* (uniform) and *viṣama* (multiform) modes, can be connected with the *sajātīya* and *vijātīya piṇḍībandhas*. Where the different dancers display generically connected *piṇḍīs* (for example where they show different *piṇḍīs* of the same deity) that would be *sajātīya piṇḍībandha*. Where they exhibit heterogeneous forms of *piṇḍīs* (*piṇḍīs* relating to different deities) that would be *vijātīya piṇḍībandha*. This distinction is to be seen in the *śṛṅkhalā* and *latābandha* styles.[41]

In the *pūrvaraṅga* of a play the *tāṇḍava* along with the *piṇḍībandha* dance forms, was executed.[42] After the placement of the orchestra,

commence the *āsāritas*[43] and the *upohana*[44] is rendered. Stringed instruments like *vīṇā* and percussion instruments are played. Assuming a proper pose *(sthāna)*, the first dancer enters, performs the *recakas* (i.e., rotatory movement of waist, hands and feet) and offering flowers to the gods pays obeisance to them. The basic idea is that initially she is to dance the *paryastaka*. This has been described as one of the *aṅgahāras*. Percussion instruments are to be played while she performed the *paryastaka*, and the *vīṇa* was played in a fast tempo. Thus she danced till the conclusion of the first *āsārita*. With the commencing of the second *āsārita* and *upohana* entered the second dancer. The first dancer now performs the *piṇḍibandha*, while the second or the newcomer, the *paryastaka*.[45] With the commencing of the third *āsārita* and *upohana*, enters the third dancer dancing the *paryastaka*, while the first two now perform the *piṇḍībandha*. The same procedure is repeated with the entrance of the fourth dancer during the fourth *āsārita*, and now three dancers execute the *piṇḍībandha*. When the fourth dancer too, has executed the *paryastaka* then all four perform the *piṇḍībandha* and make their final exit from the stage.[46] Thus, four dancers enter with the four *āsāritas*. They enter one by one, perform the *paryastaka*, and on the entrance of the other execute the *piṇḍībandha*, and finally all leave[47] the stage together.

Three different versions of the performance of *piṇḍībandha* performed during the *pūrvaraṅga* have been taken up viz. that of Nandikeśvara described by Kīrtidhara and cited by Abhinava[48] and the version given by Kumbhā as found in the *Bharatakośa*.[49]

The description given by Abhinava is simple and clear and has already been discussed. In the tradition of Abhinava, *piṇḍībandha* was accompanied by only the four *āsāritas* and the *vardhamānaka* and is associated with the *tāṇḍava*.

The *Nandikeśvarmata* for the *pūrvaraṅga* and that of Kumbhā is a long and complex one and quite different from the tradition of Abhinava. *Piṇḍībandha*, here, is performed through three stages as it is accompanied by *āsāritas*, *vardhamānaka* and *dhruvā* in that order. Bharata has said that an *āsārita* has three *vastus*[50] and four *aṅgas* or limbs viz. *mukha*, *pratimukha*, *deha* and *saṁharaṇa*. But, apparently to match the *piṇḍībandhas* and *aṅgas*, a fourth *vastu* also gets mentioned here. *Vastu* denotes a unit of musical composition including both meaningful and meaningless words. These are brought in different stages in the *gītakas*, *āsāritas* etc. The dances here illustrated the meaning of the songs. Different *piṇḍībandhas* correspond to different *vastus*. Different dancers performed the different *vastus*. There was generally an alternation of solo and group performances. The performance

comprised dance—*nṛtta* i e., *piṇḍībandha* here and other *aṅgahāras*, and *nṛtya* i.e. *abhinaya* and music—vocal and instrumental.[51] Since the *Nandikeśvaramata* and the version of Kumbhā are too complicated and obscure, a mere description of the various steps as given in the text does not bring out the whole where progression, repetition and alternation are important elements of the structure. Hence, they have been sought to be represented below by a chart so that the steps may be viewed in clearer perspective and a pattern traced therein.

Āsārita	Illustrative dance (both *nṛtta* and *nṛtya*) with *piṇḍībandha* formation; alternative solo and group	
I. *First Āsārita*		
(i) (a) 1st *upohana*	*upohana*—singing and acting	
(b) 1st *vastu*	*puṣpapiṇḍī-piṇḍi* form *sūcā*[52]	
	-*ābhinaya*	group
	vartita karaṇa-nṛtta	
	vaiśākharecita karaṇa and	solo
	aṅgahāra first *vastu abhinaya*	1st dancer
	aṅgahāra piṇḍībandha upohana	group
(ii) (a) 2nd *upohana*	*upohana*	solo
(b) 2nd *vastu*	2nd *vastu-abhinaya*	2nd
	paryastaka[53]–*nṛtta*	dancer
Āsārita	: Illustrative dance (both *nṛtta* and with *piṇḍībandha* formation *nṛtya*) alternative solo and group	
	śṛṅkhalā	group
	upohana	
	1st *vastu* by 1st dancer	repetition
	aṅgahāra by 2nd dancer	solo
	upohana in *piṇḍībandha*	repetition group
(iii) (a) 3rd *upohana*	*upohana*	solo
	3rd *vastu*	3rd dancer
	latāpiṇḍī-group	
	1st *vastu* by 1st dancer	repetition
	2nd *vastu* by 2nd dancer	*solo*
	upohana-piṇḍībandha	repetition
	upohana-śṛṅkhalā	group

(iv) (a) 4th *upohana*	4th *vastu*	solo
(b) 4th *vastu*	*bhedyaka*-group.	
	1st, 2nd, 3rd *vastus* by	repetition
	1st, 2nd, 3rd dancers	solo
	respectively	repetition
	latā, *śṛṅkhalā*, *piṇḍībandha*	group

In his commentary, Abhinava mentions a number of *uparūpakas*. These compositions are not dramas in the strict sense of the word, but have more of dance and song. Abhinava terms them as *nṛttātmaka prabandhas—Ete prabandhāḥ nṛttātmakāḥ na nāṭyātmakānāṭākādivilakṣaṇāḥ.*[54] In fact, Abhinava is the first person to mention such compositions, which were later termed *uparūpakas*. He enumerates a number of them. The last two mentioned are *Hallīsaka* and *Rāsaka*, which refer to the *piṇḍībandha* style of dancing. The *Rāsaka* has been described by him as containing many *nartakīs* or dancers—sixty-four pairs are mentioned—and containing both *uddhata* (vigorous) and *anuddhata* (gentle) elements.[55] In fact, Bhoja in his *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa* says that *Rāsaka* is a group of dance by the *nartakīs* executing the patterns of the *piṇḍīs*. He speaks of sixteen, eighteen or twelve *nartakīs* in such *Rāsakas*.[56] Similarly, the *Nāṭya-rāsaka*, also called *Carcarī*, the last *uparūpaka* mentioned by Bhoja, also has the *piṇḍībandhas* constructed with *latās*, *bhedyakas* and *gulmas*.[57] This dance, to be performed in spring time is a pure dance of the *piṇḍī*, *bhedyaka* and other group movements and patterns. Initially a pair of *nartakīs* enter, strew flowers, dance and exit. Then two others enter, and thus groups are formed which execute the *gulma*, *śṛṅkhalā* etc. There are precussion instruments, accompanied by recital of rhythmic syllables, beating of sticks and songs. Some details of *tāla* are also given by Bhoja. The whole performance is to conclude with a *maṅgala śloka* which says that *Rāsaka*, full of *piṇḍī*, *śṛṅkhalā* etc. and danced to the accompaniment of various instruments, was originated by gods when they danced with joy on getting *amṛta* or nectar after churning the Kṣīrasāgara or milky ocean.

Śāradātanaya takes *Rāsaka* as being three-fold viz. *Daṇḍa-rāsaka*, *Maṇḍala-rāsaka*, and *Nāṭya-rāsaka*. The *Karpūramañjarī* of Rājaśekhara describes the *Daṇḍa-rāsaka* as being performed by numerous *nartakīs* wheeling round and forming wonderful patterns.[58] In the Sanskrit-Tamil text called the *Śuddhananda-prakāśa*, the patterns of *piṇḍībandha* are said to be formed with hexagonal or octagonal designs—*ṣaṭkoṇairaṣṭakoṇaiśca piṇḍībandhairmanoharaiḥ*. The *Hallīsaka* has been described as the form where there were several *nāyikās* and one *nāyaka* and the women danced in circles.[59]

We may conclude that *piṇḍībandha* has two aspects corresponding to the two-fold derivation of the word itself. On the one hand, the word *piṇḍībandha* meant the constitution of a *piṇḍī* or divine emblem, and stood for a special ritualistic dance used for worship, especially in the worship of gods in the *pūrvaraṅga*. It abounded in cosmic symbolism. On the other hand, *piṇḍībandha* meant the formation of a *piṇḍa* or 'lumping' of the dancers together in a cluster. In this sense, *piṇḍībandha* was a group dance, derived from folk origins. This aspect became clearer in the *uparūpakas*, like the *Rāsaka* and the *Hallīsaka*. Thus, one aspect of *piṇḍībandha* constituted its earlier and original phase[60] within the tradition of major drama. The other aspect dominated in the popular or folk dance dramas. It is just possible that the tradition of the *uparūpakas* represented an ancient folk tradition which received some standardisation only in later times.[61]

The present day term for the word dance is *nṛtya*. However, this had a different connotation in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Though an integral part of dance, *nṛtya* would be more properly termed as *abhinaya*. Pure dance was termed *nṛtta*. *Abhinaya* is so called because it leads up to the main theme of dance and suggests its idea to the audience.

Nṛtta or pure dance in the *NŚ* consists of the following elements—

1 *Nṛttahasta*	—These have been described alongwith the *saṁyuta* and *asaṁyuta hastas*
2 *Sthāna*	—posture
3 *Cārī*	—*bhaumī* and *ākāśikī*
4 Movements of hands and feet	—*karaṇas*
5 Sequence of *karaṇas*	—*aṅgahāras*

Sthana, Cari and Karanas

Six *sthānas* or postures to be assumed by men are enumerated in the *NŚ*. They are *Vaiṣṇava*, *Samapāda*, *Vaiśākha*, *Maṇḍala*, *Pratyālīḍha* and *Ālīḍha*.[62]

Vaiṣṇava[63]—The feet are kept two and a half spans *(tāla)* away. One foot is in the natural or *sama* position, the other foot in *pakṣasthita*, is kept in *tryasra*. i.e. the toes pointing obliquely outwards. The shank is slightly bent and the limbs are kept in *sauṣṭhava*[64] i.e., when the limbs are in complete equilibrium. Its presiding deity is Viṣṇu. This *sthāna* is used in the *śṛṅgāra*, *vīra*, *adbhuta* and *bībhatsa rasas*. It is used by men of *uttama* (superior) *prakṛti* and *madhyama* (medium) type in natural conversation while engaged in various activities. It should also be used in the releasing of *cakras* or in slinging a bow. This posture is also assumed by the *Sūtradhāra*.[65]

Samapāda[66]—Where both the feet are kept in a *sama* position at

a distance of one *tāla* from each other and the limbs are kept in *sauṣṭhava*, such a *sthāna* is termed *samapāda*. Brahmā is it presiding deity. It should be used where there is staging of accepting the blessings given by the Brāhamaṇs. Other occasions of its usage are flying birds, people belonging to various sects like Śaivas etc., those practising vows, those in aerial vehicles and those in chariots.

Vaiśākha[67]—The two thighs are kept motionless at a distance of three and a half *tālas* from each other.[68] The two feet are kept in *tryasra*. Its presiding deity is Skandha. It is used in the performance of *Recakas* It is also employed for the gazing of big birds, throwing of arrows, fighting, riding horses etc.

Maṇḍala[69]—The two feet are kept 4 *tālas* apart.[70] The feet are *tryasra* and the *kaṭi* and *jānu* in natural position. Its presiding deity is Indra. It is employed is the staging of weapons like bow and *vajra*, riding on elephants and looking at big birds.

Ālīḍha[71]—The same position as the *maṇḍala sthāna*, but the right foot is placed 5 *tālas* apart. Its presiding deity is Rudra and it is used in heroic (*vīra*) or furious *(raudra) rasas*. By *Ālīḍha* one should represent wrangling arising from jealousy, increasing anger, fight of wrestlers, enemies, their escape from battle and releasing of weapons.

Pratyālīḍha[72]—Contrary of *ālīḍha*; the right foot is in *kuñcita* position and the left leg is extended. The weapons aimed at (at the target) in the *ālīḍha sthāna*, are actually to be thrown now in assuming the *pratyālidna sthāna*.

In Chapter 12 of the *NŚ* are enumerated the *sthānas* for women. They are *Āyata*, *Avahittha* and *Aśvakrānta*.[73]

Āyata[74]—Where the right foot is in *sama* or natural position and the left foot is *tryasra* at a distance of one *tāla*. The face is cheerful, one hand in *latā* pose, the other on the hip. This *sthāna* is used for first entering the stage, offering flowers, anger arising out of desire or jealousy, in cracking fingers, in negation, in assuming anger due to jealous love, profundity, invocation, dismissal, for observing the sky etc.

Avahittha[75]—This is the same as *āyata* but with the feet reversed—i.e. the left foot *sama*, right *tryasra*. The arms are again on the hip and in the *latā* pose. This *sthāna* should be used in deliberation, satisfaction, natural conversation, in looking at one's own *śṛṅgāra*, towards the path of a lover etc.

Aśvakrānta[76]—One foot is kept in the *sama* position—the other in *sūcī* pose. The *agratalasañcara* is also mentioned. This *sthāna* should be used in stumbling, holding up clothes which slip down, receiving bunches of flowers, taking hold of a two branch, and in *lalita*.

Cārī is the movement of lower limbs. The harmonised and co-

ordinated actions of the feet, calf, thigh and waist are known as *cāris*. The importance of *cāri* is summed up thus in the *NŚ*—

Yadetatprastutam nāṭyam taccārīśveva saṁjñitam/
nahi caryā vinā kiñcinnāṭye'ṅgaṁ sampravartate//— *NŚ*, 10.6.

Cāris are of two types earthly (*bhaumi*) and aerial (*ākāśiki*). There are 32 *cāris* – 16 *bhaumi cāris*[77] and 16 *ākāśiki cāris*.[78]

Samapāda[79]—The two feet close together, toes at one level facing front and *samapāda* posture.

Sthitāvarta[80]—One foot in *agratalasañcara* dragging on the ground moves across the side of the other foot to form a *svastika*.

Śakaṭāsya[81]—The upper part of the body is held firmly, one foot in *agratalasañcara* is stretched forward, and the chest is kept in *udvahita*.

Adhyardhika[82]—The left foot is placed near the heel[83] of the right foot. The right foot is drawn to its own side and placed obliquely.[84]

Cāṣagati[85]—Bharata defines it thus—the right foot is put forward and then taken back, the left foot back and front similarly. But since this is not too clear Abhinava explains thus—The right foot is put forward by a span (*tāla*), then drawn by two spans, then simultaneously with jumping movements both the feet approach each other a little and separate, (or) separate and approach each other. This is termed *cāṣagati* and is used in frightened movements etc.[86]

Vicyava[87]—From the *samapāda* position the feet are lifted up and the foreparts are brought down (*nikuṭṭana*) on the ground.

Eḍakākrīḍita[88]—*Agratalasañcara* foot, jump and then dropping on the ground; such a movement is observed by each foot turnwise.[89]

Baddha[90]—The two thighs make the *valana* movements and the shanks are crossed in *svastika*.

Ūrūdvṛtta—Bharata[91] describes it thus—*agratalasañcara* foot-heel facing outwards, thigh *añcita* and *udvṛtta*. Abhinava explains thus[92]—The heel of one foot in *agratalasañcara* is placed facing the back of the other foot. One of the shanks with the knee bent and turned inward faces the other shank. Then it is called *Ūrūdvṛtta cārī*. It is employed to indicate shyness, jealousy etc.

Āḍḍita[93]—One foot in *agratalasañcara* alternately rubs against the forepart and back of the other foot [94]

Utspandita[95]—The foot moves slowly in the manner of the *Recaka*. Abhinava says that according to some the *Recaka nṛtta hasta*[96]

is also used here.

Janitā[97]—One foot is in *agratalasañcara*; one hand is kept in the *muṣṭi* pose on the chest and the other extended out. Abhinava[98] says that *agratalasañcara* movement is important here. The other movements (i.e. of the hands) are only secondary. In fact he goes so far as to say that this is the basis of all the *cārīs*. Hence the name *Janitā*.

Syanditā[99]– When there is a distance of five *tālas* between the 2 feet it is *Syanditā*.[100] Abhinava explains that when the foot (left) is in *sama* position, thigh is motionless and right foot is extended to five *tālas* it is *Syanditā*.

Apasyanditā[101]—This is explained by Abhinava as a reverse of *Syanditā*.[102]

Samotsaritamattali[103]—Both the feet in, where *agratalasañcara* is kept behind the other foot making a *svastika* at the shank. Then the other foot is made *agratalasañcara* and in this fashion the feet make circular movements, This *cārī*, says Abhinava, is used to indicate moderate intoxication.[104]

Mattali[105]—*Apasarpaṇa* of feet in a circular fashion. Abhinava explains thus—The feet with the sole touching the ground are crossed in *svastika* at the shanks and slightly oblique. Then with a circular movement they either come together or move away from each other. It is used to indicate slight intoxication.[106]

Atikrāntā[107]—The *kuñcita* foot is raised and then extended and put forward. Abhinava explains thus—The *kuñcita* foot is taken to the base level of the other foot and then dropped forward by 4 *tālas*.[108]

Apakrāntā[109]—From a *valana* of the thighs the *kuñcita* foot is taken and dropped to the sides. Abhinava says that the *valana* of thighs indicates *baddha cārī*.[110]

Pārśvakrāntā[111]—The *kuñcita* foot is lifted up on its own side and dropped by the heel[112] on the ground, and thus by the *udghāṭita*[113] movement the *Pārśvakrāntā* is formed.

Ūrdhvajānu[114]—The *kuñcita* foot is raised, the knee is level with the breast, the other leg is motionless. This movement is repeated by both the feet.

Sūcī[115]—The *kuñcita* foot is raised, the knee is level with the chest, the shank is stretched fully[116] and then dropped to the ground on its forepart.

Nūpurapādikā[117]—An *añcita* foot is lifted, touches the *sphik* hips (? or back of the thigh ?) with its heel[118] and then toes touch

the ground.

Dolāpāda[119]—A *kuñcita* foot is lifted, swayed from side to side and then comes down on its heel, i.e. as an *añcita* foot.

Ākṣiptā[120]—A *kuñcita* foot is lifted to the height of three *tālas*, brought to the other side, and then crossing the shank (with the other) in *svastika* falls to the ground on its heel.[121]

Āviddhā[122]—The initial position is the *svastika*, then stretched as a *kuñcita* foot and brought down on the heel i.e., as an *añcita* foot. Abhinava elaborates thus—from *svastika* made without the shanks touching each other, *kuñcita* foot is stretched, brought to its own side and made to fall on its heel in the region of the other heel.[123]

Udvṛttā[124]—Derived from the *āviddha cārī*, slight jump, turning round and the foot falls to the ground. Abhinava says this is related to the *āviddha cārī*. The heel is kept in the region of the other thigh. Then jumping up, and turning round the foot is made to fall on the ground. Then the other foot is raised and performs the movements.[125]

Vidyutbhrāntā[126]—The foot is taken back, touches the head, is turned round in all directions then stretched.

Alāta[127]—A foot is stretched backwards, then it is turned round and its sole faces the other thigh[128] and then its heel is brought down to the ground on its own side.

Bhujaṅgatrāsitā[129]—Abhinava explains thus—A *kuñcita* foot is raised, taken to the joint of the other thigh, then due to the *vivartana* of the waist i.e. turning the *trika* and the knee, the heel of this foot faces the other hip, then the thigh in this oblique position is turned *(vivartana)*; thus the knee moves to its own side, the sole of the foot facing upwards. It is, used in showing the gait of a man afraid of a snake nearby.[130]

Hariṇapluta[131]—A *kuñcita* foot is raised as in the *atikrānta cārī*, and after a jump is dropped on the ground. Then the other shank is kept taken back[132] and kept *añcita* and finally brought back to the ground. Abhinava says that this *cārī* was done by *vidūṣakas* or jesters. Śārṅgadeva has termed it as *mṛgapluta*.[133]

Daṇḍapāda[134]—A *kuñcita* foot as in *nūpura-pāda* is extended forward. Thigh, knee and shank are straight as a staff.

Bhrāmarī[135]—As in the *atikrānta cārī* a *kuñcita* foot is raised and as in the *bhujaṅgatrāsitā* the thigh, which is oblique, is twisted around. The whole body turns round through the turning of the sole of the other foot and the *vivartana* of the *trika*.[136]

KARANAS

Name	Hand	Feet	Sthāna	Cārī	Head	Shoulders	Chest	Sides
1. **Tala-puspaputa**[137]	*Vyāvartana-parivartana* Movement, *Puṣpapuṭa*	*Agratala-sañcara*		*Adhyardhika*				*Sannata*
2. **Vartita**	*Svastika Vyāvartana-parivartana*[138] (hands dropped) as *Uttāna*	*agratala-sañcara*						
3. **Valitoruka**[139]	*Vyāvartana-parivartana*	*Valita* (thighs)		*Ākṣipta*				
4. **Apaviddha**[140]	*Āvartana* of right hand, then drops on thigh; left hand *śukatuṇḍa* on chest			*Ākṣipta*[141]				
5. **Sama-nakha**[142]	*Latā*[143]	*Samanakha* (i.e. the feet touching each other with the toes placed level					body in natural position	

		on ground)						
6. **Lina**[144]	*Ūrdhva-maṇḍala* (*nṛtta-hasta*) *añjali* on chest (*saṁyutahasta*)				bent neck	shoulders raised		
7. **Svastika Recita**	*Recita Aviddha-vakra Svastika*[145] *Pakṣavañcita Pakṣapradyota*							
8. **Mandala Svastika**[146]	*Ūrdhvamaṇḍalī Svastika*		*Maṇḍala*	*Vicyava*				
9. **Nikutta-kam**[147]	*Caturasra Alpadama* (*nikuṭṭana* is done)	*Udghaṭṭita*	*Maṇḍala*					
10. **Ardha-Nikuttakam**[148]						shoulders *añcita*		
11. **Katicchinna**[149]	*Pallava*		*Maṇḍala*	*Bhrāmarī*				*Chinna* waist (i.e. *valana* of waist) *Sannata*
12. **Ardha-Recita**[150]	*Kaṭakamukha Sūcīmukha*	*Nikuṭṭita*	*Maṇḍala*					
13. **Vaksah-Svastika**[151]	*Recita Svastika*	*Svastika*					*Nikuñcita*	
14. **Unmatta-kam**[152]	*Recita*	*Añcita*		*Āviddha*[153]				

15. **Svastika[154]**	*Svastika*	*Svastika*		Jump[155]	
16. **Prastha-[156] Svastika**	*Svastika*	*Svastika*		*Apakrānta* *Sūcī*	Turning[157] of *trika* *Svastika* *karaṇa*, executed on all sides[159]
17. **Dik-Svastika[158]**	*Svastika*	*Svastika*			
18. **Alatakam[160]**	*Nitambahasta* *Caturasra*			*Alāta* *urdhva-jānu*	
19. **Katisama[161]**	*Svastika Ardha-candra khaṭakā-mukha*		*Vaiṣṇava*	*Ākṣipta* *Apakrānta*	*Nata* *Udvāhita[162]*
20. **Aksipta-Recita[163]**	*Recita* then *ākṣipta*	*Añcita* *Sūcī*			
21. **Viksipta Ksiptakam[164]**	*Vyāvartana-parivartana*	*Vikṣepa-Ākṣepa*			
22. **Ardha-Svastika[165]**	right hand *karihasta*, left hand at chest (*Khaṭakāmukha*)[166]	*Svastika*			
23. **Ancita[167]**	*Vyāvartana-parivartana* *Alpallava[168]*				

24. **Bhujanga Trasita**[169]	*Vyāvartana-parivartana, Dolā-Khaṭakamukha*[170]	having lifted up a *kuñcita* foot, the thigh is obliquely turned	*Bhujanga-trāsita*	oblique turning of waist[170a]
25. **Urdhvajanu**[171]	*Arāla. Khaṭaka-mukha*[172]	*Kuñcita* foot is raised and knee is level with the breast	*Ūrdhvajānu*	
26. **Nikuncita**[173]	*AB*-2 views at I. *Arāla*–side of head *Arāla*–brought from region of nose to chest II. *Sūcimukha, Patākā*	*Vṛścika*[174]		
27. **Mattali**[175]	*Udveṣṭita-Nitamba, Āveṣṭita*	*Svastika* or crossing at ankles	(circular movement)	
28. **Ardha-mattali**[176]	*Recita*-left hand, right hand on hip[177]		derived from *Mattalicāri*	

29. **Recita-nikuttaka**[178]	*Recita*-right hand *dolā*-left	*nikuṭṭita*. i.e. *udghaṭṭita*-right foot		
30. **Padapaviddhaka**[179]	*Khaṭakamukha* hands at navel	*Sūci*[180] foot is brought in contact with the other foot thus *viddha* or pierced.	*Apakrānta*	
31. **Valita**[181]	*Sūcīmukha*	*Sūci*	*Bhrāmarī*	turning of *trika*
32. **Ghurnita**[182]	*Dolā*-left hand turned round-right hand	*Svastika* and then moved away		
33. **Lalita**[183]	*Karihasta*-left *Vivartita*-right[184]	*Nikuṭṭita* (i.e. *udghaṭṭita* movement)		
34. **Danda-paksa**[185]	*Latā*		*Ūrdhvajānu*	
35. **Bhujanga-Trasita-recitam**[186]	*Vikṣipta* then *Recita*, then brought to left side	*Vikṣipta*	*Bhujaṅga-trāsita*	
36. **Nupura**[187]	*Latā Recita*		*Bhrāmarī* *Nūpura-pādika*[188]	turning of *trika*

37. **Vaisakha-recita**[189]	*Recita*	*Recita*	*Vaiśākha*		*Recita* neck		*Recita-kaṭi* turning of *trika*
38. **Bhrama-raka**[190]	*Udveṣṭita*	*Ākṣipta Svastika*					
39. **Catura**[191]	*Añcita*-[192] left *catura*-right	*Nikuṭṭita* (right)					
40. **Bhujanga-ancita**[193]	*Recita*-right *Latā*-left			*Bhujaṅga-trāsita*			
41. **Dandaka-recita**[194]	*Daṇḍapakṣa*[195]			*Daṇḍapāda*			
42. **Vrscikakutti-taka**[196]	*Nikuṭṭita* or *Alapallava*	*Vṛścika*[197]					
43. **Kati-Bhranta**[198]	*Caturasra*	*Apaviddha*		*Sūcī Bhrāmarī*			turning of hip
44. **Lata-Vrscika**[199]	*Latā*-left	*Vṛścika*-right on ground-left[200]					
45. **Chinna**[201]	*Alapadma*		*Vaiśākha*				waist *chinna*
46. **Vrscika-recita**[202]	*Svastika Recita*	*Vṛścika*					
47. **Vrscika**[203]	*Añcita* i.e. *Karihasta*[204]	*Vṛścika*				bent back	
48. **Vyamsita**[205]	*Recita* hands at chest-one *Recita* hand facing		*Aliḍha*				

	up, the other down wards			
49. **Parsva-Nikuttita**[206]	*Svastika* at sides	*Nikuṭṭita*		
50. **Lalata-tilaka**[207]		foot is taken back as *Vṛścika* and then the toe touches the back of forehead		
51. **Krantaka**[208]	*Vyāvartana-parivartana, Khaṭakamukha*	*kuñcita*		
52. **Kuncita**[209]	*Kuñcita* i.e. *Alapallava; uttāna* at left side[210]	*nata* or bent[211]		
53. **Cakra-mandala**[212]	extended[213]	*apaviddha*	*Aḍḍita*[214]	body bent
54. **Uromandala**[215]	*Uromaṇḍala*		*Sthitāvartā*[216]	
55. **Aksipta**[217]	*Khaṭakamukha*		*Ākṣipta*[218]	slightly bent
56. **Talavilasita**[219]	two *patākā* hands joined together[220]	foot at the side raised and facing up		
57. **Argala**[221]	*Alapallava*-left left hand	feet two and a half *tālas* apart		

58. **Viksipta**[222]	*Udveṣṭita-apaveṣṭita* movement in same direction		*Vidyutbhrānta* *Daṇḍapāda*		
59. **Avarta**[223]	*Udveṣṭita–apaveṣṭita, Dolā*		*Cāṣagati*[224]		
60. **Dolapada**[225]	*Dolā*		*Ūrdhvajānu*[226] *Dolāpada*		
61. **Vivrtta**[227]	*Vyāvṛtta-pravartita, Recita*		*Ākṣipta* *Bhrāmarī*[228]		turning of *trika*
62. **Vinivrtta**[229]	*Recita*		*Sūcī, Baddha*		turning of *trika*
63. **Parsvakranta**[230]			*Pārśvakrānta*		
64. **Nistambhita**[231]	hand at forehead	*kuñcita*		*Sannata* chest	
65. **Vidyutbhranta**[232]		foot taken back touches the head turned round in all directions then stretched	*Vidyutbhrānta*		
66. **Atikranta**[233]			*Atikrānta*		
67. **Vivartitaka**[234]	*Ākṣipta, Recita*	*Akṣipta*			turning of *trika*

68. **Gajakri-dita**[235]	*Latā*-right, *Añcita* or *karihasta* left[236]		*Dolāpada*		
69. **Talasams-photita**[237]	*Patākā hastas* used for clapping		*Atikrānta* or *Daṇḍapāda*[238]		
70. **Garudaplu-taka**[239]	*Latā* *Recita*	extended back asin *Vṛścika*[240]		*unnata* i.e. held up.	
71. **Gandasuci**[241]	One at chest,[242] other at cheek *alapallava*[243]	*Sūci*			*nata*
72. **Parivrtta**[244]	*Ūrdhvamaṇḍali*	*Sūci*			turning of *trika*
73. **Parsvajanu**[245]	*Muṣṭi*-near chest, *ardha candra*[246] at waist.	*sama*-one foot, the other placed at the back of the thigh of the above leg			
74. **Grddhra-valinaka**[247]	extended i.e. *Latā*[248]	One foot stretched backwords, the other			

		foot slightly bent	
75. **Sannata**[249]	*Sannata* Dolā[250]	*Svastika* of feet	jump by *Hariṇapluta cārī*[251]
76. **Suci**[252]	No hands specified[253]		*Sūcī*
77. **Ardhasuci**[254]	*Alapadma* hand near head		*Sūcī cārī*[255] with right leg
78. **Sucividdha**[256]	One hand at waist (*pakṣa vañcitaka* or *ardhacandra)*, other at chest (*Khaṭakamukha)*[257]	One *Sūci* foot is kept at the heel of the other foot	
79. **Apakranta**[258]			*Apakrānta*
80. **Mayura-lalita**[259]	*Recita*	*Vṛścika*	*Bhrāmarī*[260]
81. **Sarpita**[261]	*Recita*	*Añcita* then *apasṛta* i.e. move away	*Parivartita* i.e. bent on the side[262]
82. **Dandapada**[263]	*Āviddha*		*Nūpurapādika Daṇḍapāda*

83. **Harina-pluta**[264]	No hands specified[265]		*Hariṇapluta*[266]	
84. **Prenkholi-taka**[267]			*Dolāpada* (with one foot) jump then with other foot *Bhrāmarī*[268]	turning of *trika*
85. **Nitamba**[269]	*Nitamba*[270]		*Baddha*	
86. **Skhalita**[271]	*Recita, ghūrṇita*		*Dolāpada*	
87. **Karihas-taka**[272]	One hand at chest,[273] the other performs the *Udveṣṭa* movement and forms the *tripatākā* hasta near the ear[274]	*Añcita* foot		
88. **Prasarpita**[275]	*Recitia Latā*	*Gharṣaṇa* i.e dragging movement on the ground		
89. **Simhavikridita**[276]			*Alāta*	
90. **Simhakar-sita**[277]	*Nikuñcita* i.e. explained by Abhinava as	*Vṛścika*[278]		

	Padmakośa Ūrṇanābha						
91. **Udvrtta**[279]				*Udvṛtta*			
92. **Upasrtaka**[280]	*Vyāvartana parivartana Arāla*[281]			*Ākśipta*			side bent
93. **Talasamghattita**[282]	*Patākā*-both then *Recita*-left		*Vaiṣṇava*[283]	*Dolāpada*			
94. **Janita**[284]	One hand at[285] chest-*Muṣṭi* other extended i.e. *Latā*	*agratala-sañcara*		*Janita*			
95. **Avahitthaka**[286]	gradual lowering of hands from the forehead downwards to the chest[287]			*Janita*			
96. **Nivesa**[288]	on chest[289]		*Maṇḍala*			*Nirbhugra* chest	
97. **Elakakridita**[290]	not specified[291]			*Elakākrīḍita*[292]			body bent and then twisted
98. **Urudvrtta**[293]	*Arāla Khaṭakamukha*[294]			*Ūrūdvṛtta*			
99. **Madaskhalita**[295]	extended i.e. *Dolā*	*Valita Āviddha*[296]			*Parivahita* (turned to the side)		

100. **Visnu-kranta**[297]	*Recita*	*Kuñcita* foot extended forward					
101. **Sambh-ranta**[298]	hands after *Vyāvartana-parivartana* movement rest as *Alapallava* on back of thigh[299]			*Aviddha*[300]			
102. **Viskam-bha**[301]	on chest-left	*Nikuṭṭita*		*Sūci*			
103. **Udghat-tita**[302]	hands clapping	*Udghaṭṭita*					*nata* or bent
104. **Vrsabhakri-dita**[303]	*Recita*, *Añcita* i.e. *Alapallava* on shoulders[304]			*Alāta*			
105. **Lolita**[305]	*Recita*, *Añcita* *Alapallava*		Vaiṣṇava		rolls around and rests (while rolling) at the sides *Parivahitā*[307]		
106. **Nagasar-pita**[306]	*Recita*	*Svastika* then moves away					
107. **Sakatasya**[308]	*Khaṭakamukha* at chest[309]	*Talasañcara*		*Śakaṭāsya*		*Udvahita*	body motionless
108. **Gangavata-rana**[310]	*Adhomukha tripatākā*	lifted up with sole facing upwards			bent		

Nrtya and Abhinaya

Abhinaya or mime is four-fold—*Āṅgika. Vācika, Āhārya* and *Sātvika.*[311] *Āṅgika* relates to the movement of major limbs *(aṅgas)* and minor limbs (*upāṅgas*), their use (*viniyoga*) for the expression of sentiment *(rasa)* and of dominant (*sthāyi bhāva)* and transitory moods (*sañcāri bhāva*). *Vācika* relates to speech, i.e. the prose and vérse part of the play, words of songs etc. *Āhārya* is related to costumes, make-up, etc. *Sātvika* relates to the natural condition of man.

Āṅgika abhinaya is integrally connected with dance. The three basic kinds of *āṅgika abhinaya* are—

(i) *Śārīra*—that which relates to the body.

(ii) *Mukhaja*—that which originates in the face. *Mukhābhinaya* is, in fact, the index of *rasa.*

(iii) *Ceṣṭā* —that which is produced by the movement of limbs and includes the *cārīs, aṅgahāras* etc.

Bharata has given a detailed description of the movements of *upāṅgas* and *aṅgas.* The six *aṅgas* are head *(śiraḥ)*, hands *(hastas)*, *kaṭi* (hip), *vakṣaḥ* (chest), *pārśva* (sides) and *pāda* (feet).[312] The six *upāṅgas* are eyes *(netra)*, brows *(bhrū)*, nose *(nāsā)*, lips *(adhara)*, cheek *(kapola)*, and chin *(cibuka)*.[313]

Eyes—Taking up the *upāṅgas* first, Bharata mentions thirty-six *dṛṣṭis* or glances which he classifies into 3 types. Glances expressing *rasa* are eight in number. These are *Kāntā, Bhayānakā, Hāsyā, Karuṇā, Adbhutā, Raudrī, Vīrā, Bībhatsā.*[314] Glances expressing *sthāyi bhāva* or dominant mood are eight in number too. These are *Snigdha, Hṛṣṭa, Dīna, Kruddha, Dṛpta, Bhayānvitā Jugupsitā,* and *Vismitā.*[315] There are twenty glances relating to *Vyabhicārī bhāva* or transitory moods. These are *Śūnyā, Malinā, Śrāntā, Lajjāvitā, Glānā, Śaṅkitā, Viṣaṇṇā, Mukulā, Kuñcitā, Abhitaptā, Jihmā, Lalitā, Vitarkitā, Ardhamukulā, Vibhrāntā, Viluptā, Ākekarā, Vikoṣā, Trastā* and *Madırā.*[316]

Brows—There are seven movements of the brows.[317]

Utkṣepa—Raising the brows.

Pātana—Lowering the brows.

Bhṛkuṭi—Knitting the brows.

Catura—Extending the brows in a charming fashion.

Kuñcita—Contracting the brows.

Recita—Graceful up and down movement of brows.

Sahaja--Natural position of brows.[318]

Nose—There are 6 types of movements of the nose:[319]

Nata—Frequent depressing and dilating of nostrils.

Manda—Gentle or slow movement of inhaling and exhaling.

Vikṛṣṭa—Extremely dilated nostrils.

Socchvāsa—Inhaling of air by nostrils i.e. deep breathing.
Vighūrṇita—Contracted nostrils.
Svābhavikī—Natural.[320]

Cheeks—These are of 6 types too.[321]

Kṣāma—Sunken cheeks.
Phulla—Full blown cheeks.
Pūrṇa—Raised (cheek muscles probably).
Kampita—Throbbing.
Sama—Natural position.[322]

Lips—There are six types of lip movements:[323]

Vivartana—Twisting of the lips in an awry fashion.
Kampana—Tremulous lips.
Visarga—Protruding lips.
Viniguhana—Drawing the lips inside.
Sandaṣṭaka—Lip bitten by the teeth.
Samudga—Pouting of lips.[324]

Chin—The chin or rather its various types are indicated by actions of tongue, teeth and lips. Hence Bharata describes[325] actions or types of actions of teeth. These are:[326]

Kuttana—Chattering of teeth.
Khandana—Frequent touching and separating (probably with force) of teeth.
Chinna—Tight interlocking of teeth.
Cukṣita—Keeping the two rows of teeth wide apart.
Lehana—Licking by teeth.
Sama—Slight contact of teeth. This is accepted as the natural state.
Daṣṭa—Biting of lower lip with teeth.[327]

Mukha—Besides these, Bharata also mentions 6 movements of face (*mukha*):[328]

Vivṛtta—Open with lips apart.
Vidhūta—Face lengthened obliquely.
Vinivṛtta—Face turned sideways.
Nirbhugna—Lowering of face.
Bhugna—Somewhat longdrawn face.
Udvāhī—Upturned face.[329]

The colour of the face explains the states of the mind which are expression of *rasas*. As they are useful in expressing *rasas*, the colours of the face have also been described by Bharata. These are of four kinds—*Svābhāvika* (natural), *Prasanna* (clear), *Raktā* (red) and *Śyāma* (dark).[330] *Svābhāvika* being the natural colour is used to express unexcited state. *Prasanna* is used in comic ((*hāsya*) erotic (*śṛṅ*-

gāra) and marvellous (*adbhuta*) *rasas*. *Raktā* represents the heroic (*vīra*), furious (*raudra*) etc. and also pathetic (*karuṇa*). *Śyāma* is used to represent the odious (*bībhatsa*) and fearful (*bhayānaka*) *rasas*.[331]

Neck—Finally Bharata describes nine movements of the neck:[332]

Sama—Natural position.

Nata—Bent low.

Unnata Thrown up.

Tryasra—Bent obiquely.

Recita—Shaking and moving around.

Kuñcita—Slightly bent.

Añcita—Inclined to a side and stretched.

Valita—Turned sideways.

Nivṛtta—Return to its original position after having faced something.[333]

Head—There are 13 types of head movement.[334]

Akampita—Up and down movement of head.

Kampita—Same movement in a fast speed.

Dhūta—Slow rotation of the head.

Vidhūta—The same in quick tempo.

Parivāhita—Movement of the head to the side.

Ādhūta—Head lifted obliquely upwards once.

Avadhūta—Head bent down once.

Añcita—Head with a slight sideways bent.

Nihañcita--In which the shoulders are raised and brows *kuñcita*.

Parāvṛtta—Head turned backwards to indicate looking backwards.

Utkṣipta—Head turned upwards.

Adhogata—Head turned downwards.

Lolita—Turning of head on all sides.[335]

Chest—There are five positions of the chest :[336]

Abhugna—Relaxed chest with sunken shoulders.

Nirbhugna—Straight and erect torso.

Prakampita—Where the torso is thrown upwards and slightly shaken.

Udvāhita—Torso thrown forward (as when taking a deep breath).

Sama—*Caturasra* pose and *sauṣṭhava* of limbs. Indicative of natural position.[337]

Sides—There are five positions of the sides too:[338]

Nata—Bending to the side (the body seems to bent forward slightly since the *abhugna* position is mentioned here).

Samunnata—Raising a side (this is said to be the reverse of

the former).

Parsārita—Stretching of both sides.

Vivartita—Turning of *trika* or *sacrum*.

Apasṛta—Reversion of *trika* from the *nivartita* position, i.e. turning around from the sideways position.[339]

Hips (Kati)—There are 5 types of movements of the *kaṭi*:[340]

Chinna—*Valana* of the middle i.e. turning of the middle (of the body) obliquely on the sides.

Nivṛtta—Facing the front while the body is twisted sideways.

Recita—Rotating the hip on all sides.

Kampita--Quick movement of hip from side to side.

Udvāhita—When the hip is raised slowly from one side to the other.[341]

Thighs (Uru)—There are five type of movements of the thighs :[342]

Kampana—Repeated toe-heel movement; as a result the up and down movement which indicates the gait of low-class people.

Valana—Bharata describes *valana* as the movement of knee inwards. But from its description in the 108 *karaṇas* and from Abhinava's commentary it becomes apparent that *valana* is actually the crossing of the thighs.

Stambhana—Motionless thigh.

Udvartana—*Valana* and *Apaviddha* movement of thigh (probably crossing of thigh, then uncrossing and motionless thigh).

Vivartana—Turning of heel inwards[343] (porsibly in circular movement ?).

Shanks (Jangha)—The movement here is of five types :[344]

Āvartita—When the left foot moves to the right, and right to the left. *Svastika* of shanks too has been mentioned. Indicates jesters' walk.[345]

Nata—Knee is bent.

Kṣipta—Throwing the shank outwards; used in *tāṇḍava*.[346]

Udvahita—Raised shank. (Actually Bharata mentions 3 movements—bending of knees, throwing of shanks outwards, and then raising them upwards).

Parivṛtta—Crosswise movement of shanks.

Feet (Pada)—Five types of foot movement have been enumerated by Bharata:[347]

Udghaṭṭita—Standing on the balls of the feet and bringing the heels down to the ground.

Sama—The foot rests on the ground in a natural way.

Agratalasañcara—When the heel is raised, the big toe stretches and the other toes curves down, i.e. when only the big toe touches the ground and rest of the foot is lifted up. Used in various *recaka* movements.

Añcita—When the heels are on the ground, the balls of the feet lifted up and toes stretched.

Kuñcita—Toes bent, heel raised, arch bent i.e. the toes and ball of the feet touch the ground and the heel is raised.

Besides these Bharata also mention the *tryasra* foot and the *sūcīpāda.*

Tryasra—The foot is kept on the ground as *sama*, but the heel points inward and the toes sideway i.e. *sama* foot with the toes kept obliquely.

Sūcīpāda—Left foot kept naturally and of the right foot only the tip of the toe touches the ground, the rest is raised.

Hands—Bharata enumerates four basic movements or *karaṇas* of the hands :[348]

Āveṣṭita Hand—If the fingers begining with the forefinger point inwards gradually, then it is known as the *Āveṣṭita* hand i.e, the fingers, commencing with the forefinger and ending with the little finger, are gracefully turned towards the palm.

Udveṣṭita Hand—Fingers begining with the forefinger open outwards (i.e. away from the body), i.e. fingers bent in *Āveṣṭita* are opened out in the same order.

Vyāvartita Hand—The fingers beginning with the little finger point inwards gradually i.e. the fingers are bent as in *Āveṣṭita*, but commencing with the little finger and ending in forefinger.

Parivartita Hand—The fingers, beginning with the little finger and ending with the forefinger open outwards.

Hand poses or movements have been classified by Bharata into three types. These are *Asaṁyuta-hasta*, *Saṁyuta-hasta* and *Nṛtta-hasta*. The first is perfermed by a single hand, the second by both the hands and third is frequently used in *nṛtta*.

Asamyuta Hastas—The *Asaṁyuta-hastas* are twenty-four.[349]

Pataka

Nature : The palm and fingers are outstretched, the fingers pressing against one another. The thumb is *kuñcita*, bent, touching the root of the forefinger.

Use : Administering a slap to indicates flames, rain, an aerial shower of flowers—to be indicated with slightly moving *patākā*

fingers; small ponds, a gift of flowers, new grass to be indicated by *patākā* hands crossed in *Svastika* then uncrossed; *svastika*, uncrossing then *adhomukha* (i.e. palm facing down) indicate closing and disclosing. *Patākā* fingers moving down and up indicates movement of wind and waves; one *patākā* hand placed on the other and rubbed quickly indicates washing.

Tripataka[350]

Nature : *Patākā* hand with the ring finger bent.

Use : Calling, salutation, a turban (*tripatākā* hand at the head). The *tripatākā* hand moving upwards from below indicates fast flying of birds, fast moving stream, movement of serpents, whirpool etc. Wiping of tears by the bent ring-finger, *tilaka* (auspicious mark) on forehead, touching of curls on forehad; *tripatākā* hand is *svastika*, i.e. thin crossing should be done in touching the feet of elders. Also used in the presence of the king, hermits, bridegroom etc.

Kartarimukha[351]

Nature : The forefinger of the *tripatākā* is put behind the middle finger.

Use : To indicate falling, death, activities of deer, buffalo, elephant etc.

Ardhacandra[352]

Nature : The fingers are pressed close to one another and bent i.e. the fingers are bent to resemble a bow (the thumb too is bent on the other side, the whole resembling the form of the crescent moon).

Use : Indicates the crescent moon, ornaments of ladies etc.

Arala[353]

Nature : Fingers are separated from each other and slightly bent, the forefinger is curved down like a bow and the thumb bent.

Use : Represents benedictions, gathering of a woman's hair into a knot or loosening it marriage etc., calling, wiping of sweat, etc. Women use the *Arāla hasta* for enacting situations of the *tripatākā*.

Sukatunda[354]

Nature : The forefinger and ring-finger of *Arāla* are very much bent.

Use : Used to indicate anger due to jealousy between lovers, exchange of hot words, dismissal, contempt etc.

Musti[355]

Nature : The finger-tips rest compactly in the middle of the palm. Thumb is pressed against the middle finger (resembles a closed

fist).

Use : Used to represent holding of a spear, sword, stick and also fighting, exercise, etc.

Sikhara[356]

Nature : The thumb of *muṣṭi* pointing upwards.

Use : Holding the reins, hurling the javelin or spear, grasping a bow, arrow or goad, adorning of lips, of feet with lac-dye, rearranging curls etc.

Kapittha[357]

Nature : Tip of forefinger of the *Śikhara* touches the tip of the thumb.

Use : Employed in the holding of various weapons.

Khatakamukha[358]

Nature : Ring finger and little finger of the *Kapittha* are thrown upward, separated and bent.

Use : Holding the *chatra* i.e. canopy, reins of horses, of a mirror, a long stick; putting on strings of pearls or garlands of flowers, plucking of flowers, churning.

Sucimukha[359]

Nature : The forefinger of the *Khaṭakāmukha* is stretched upwards.

Use : Indicates *cakra* (discus), lightening, flag, ear ornaments, crooked gait, young of a snake, etc.

Padmakosa[360]

Nature : In *Padmakośa* the fingers and also the thumb are separated from each other, bent like a bow, but facing upwards and the finger tips remain unattached.

Use : Employed to represent *bilva kapittha*, *lemon* and other fruits, breasts of women, worshipping of god, and making of offerings.

Sarpasiras[361]

Nature : All the fingers joined together and the thumb bent—when such a hand (i.e. the *Patākā)* is curved in the middle, it is the *sarpaśiras*.

Use : Offering of water, movement of a serpent, stroking the temples of an elephant, wrestlers in a contest.

Mrgasirsaka[362]

Nature : All the fingers (except little finger) are joined to each other and are *adhomukha* i.e. face downwards. The thumb and the little finger project upwards (i.e. of the *sarpaśiras* hand the litle finger and thumb extend upwards).

Use : Signifies today, here, how; used to wipe off perspiration from cheek, forehead etc.

Kangula[363]

Nature : The ring finger is bent, the little finger points upwards and the thumb, forefinger and middle finger are held upwards in a triangular position like that of the three sacrificial fires—*Tretāgni*.

Use : Used to represent small fruits, angry words spoken by women, also beautiful flowers.

Alapallava[364]

Nature : The *vyāvartita* movement is made and then the fingers are arranged sidewise along the palm (in the *vyāvartita* movement the palm faces upwards –*uttāna*) and closed, the little finger pointing towards the body. Now to get the *Alapallava* hand the palm opens out, forefinger first (almost horizontical), then open the middle finger, ring finger and little finger respectively, each successively a little higher than the previous one; the thumb too opens out to its own side.

Use : In negation, *ātmopanyasa* (?) of women.

Catura[365]

Nature : The three fingers (the little finger excluded) are extended (in a slanting position, i.e. not projected vertically) the little finger points upwards and the thumb touches the middle of the three fingers i.e. the middle finger.

Use : Used to represent reasoning, modesty, discipline, skill and also for indicating some abstract things like happiness, character, sweetness, mind, memory, youth, forgiveness, purity, generosity etc.

Bhramara[366]

Nature : The tips of the middle finger and thumb joined together, the forefinger bent and the ring finger and little finger extended upwards.

Use : For holding flowers with long stalks; also indicates ear-rings, conversation of children, scolding somebody etc.

Hamsapaksa[367]

Nature : The three fingers beginning with the forefinger are slightly bent at their roots, the little finger bent up and thumb bent.

Use : Used for *ācamana* (ceremonial sipping of water), anointing with sandal-paste, embracing, touching, pressing the legs, a huge pillar; also indicates various *rasas* in *śṛṅgāra*; used for keeping the breasts of women; is indicative of supporting the chin in sorrow, etc.

Samdansa[368]

Nature : The tips of the thumb and forefinger touch each other

and the middle of the palm is made slightly hollow. It is of three types : *Agraja* i.e. facing forward, *Mukhaja* i.e. towards the face, and *Pārśvaja* i.e. facing sideways.

Use : *Agraja saṁdaṁśa*—plucking of flowers and gathering of a blade of grass, leaf, hair, thread etc. *Mukhaja saṁdaṁśa*—removing flowers from their stalks, saying angrily 'Fie (upon you)' etc. *Pārśvaja saṁdaṁśa*—threading of pearls or piercing them. wearing of the *yajñopavīta* or sacred thread, to indicate sentences of anger, contempt, jealousy and blame. The left hand forms the *saṁdaṁśa* and its tip is slightly whirled around. Women form the *saṁdaṁśa* hand to indicate various things—painting a picture, applying collyrium to the eye, in argument and for preparation of lac-dye paste.

Mukula[369]

Nature : All the fingers are held compactly together, and pointing upwards are joined to the tip of the thumb.

Use : Worship of gods. offering oblations, bud of a lotus, *viṭaś* kiss (i.e. a flying kiss), eating, giving, haste and counting gold. When opened out and then restored to its normal pose it indicates some contemptible action.

Urnanabha[370]

Nature : When the five fingers of the *Padmakośa* are bent, it is termed *ūrṇanābha*.

Use : Grasping somebody's hair, a stealthy grasping, scratching one's head, beasts like lion, tiger etc., lifting up a stone etc.

Tamracuda[371]

Nature : The tips of the middle finger and the thumb are pressed against each other, the forefinger is bent and the little finger and ring finger rest on the palm. (i.e. the *Bhramara* pose), but the difference lies with the ring finger and little finger which rest on the palm. According to another definition[372] when the little finger of the *Muṣṭi* is stretched out it is known as *Tāmracūḍa*.[373]

Use : Beckoning a child, rebuke, measuring time, inspiring confidence.

SAMYUTA HANDS

Anjali[374]

Nature : Placing together of two *Patākā* hands.

Use : Salutation of deities—*añjali* hands at head, salutation of preceptors and elders, salutation of friends, *añjali* hands at chest. Thus the *añjali* hands are used by men in three ways; but by women they can be used in any manner.

Kapotaka[375]

Nature : Two hands (*añjali*) touch each other only at the side.

Use : When facing forward, it is used in saluting or in conversing with the preceptor and for expressing modesty. A slightly shaking *kapotaka* hand kept at the chest is used by women to express cold or fear. The fingers rubbing against the palm and then left is used to represent sentences expressing unhappiness.

Karka ta[376]

Nature : Fingers of the two hands interlocked with each other.

Use : Indicative of one who is aroused by passion, yawning, stretching one's body, holding the chin, holding a conch etc.

Svastika[377]

Nature : Where two hands, with one wrist placed over the other, face upwards (*uttāna*) at the left side of the body that is called *Svastika*. Bharata's injuction is that it should be used mostly by women.

Use : Crossing the hands in *svastika* and then uncrossing them indicates directions, clouds, sky, forest, sea, seasons, earth and vast stretches of water and the like.

Khatakavardhamanaka[378]

Nature : The hands assume the *Khaṭakāmukha* pose and form a *svastika* at the wrists.

Use : It indicates *Śṛṅgāra* or love, salutation, lily, holding an umbrella etc.

Utsanga[379]

Nature : When two *Arāla* hands are crossed in *svastika*[380] and face the body,[381] then the hands are called *Utsaṅga*.

Use : Indicative of touch, jealousy of women, refusing to be placated by the hero etc.

Nisadha[382]

Nature : Four alternate definitions and usages of *Niṣadha* have been given by Bharata. Firstly, when *kapittha* encircles *Mukula*, this is known as *Niṣadha*.[383]

Use : Indication of collection, accepting, not forsaking the truth, that which is well established, etc.

OR

Nature : When the *Śikhara* hand is pressed by *Mṛgaśirṣa*, that is termed as *Niṣadha*.

Use : Indicative of one who is gripped with fear.

OR

Nature : When the right hand, being gripped at the elbow by the left, rests on the left hand forming the *muṣṭi*, this is termed

as *Niṣadha.*

Use : Indicative of patience, arrogance, beauty, curiosity, the immobility of pillar.

OR

Nature : When *Haṁsapakṣa* hands face away then this is known as *Niṣadha.*

Use : Used for indicating the breaking of a net or window.

Dola[384]

Nature : Two *Patākā* hands hang down with loose fingers and relaxed shoulders.

Use : Indicative of intoxication, fainting, dejection, hurry, illness, being wounded by weapons etc.

Puspaputa[385]

Nature : Two *Sarpaśiras* hands with their external sides brought together.

Use : Used for holding and giving away of grains, flowers, fruits etc. and also water.

Makara[386]

Nature : Two *adhomukha* (facing down) *Patākā* hands with thumbs extended upwards are placed on top of the other.

Use : Used to represent crocodile, shark, fish, tiger, serpent and other carnivorous animals.

Gajadanta[387]

Nature : Two *Sarpaśiras* hands are placed between each others' shoulder and elbow.

Use : Indicates the carrying of the bridegroom to the place of marriage,[388] lifting massive weights, holding pillars etc.

Avahittha[389]

Nature : Two *Śukatuṇḍa* hands facing each other and kept at the chest are turned downwards and are gradually lowered.

Use : Indicates weakness, breathing out, thinness of the body, eagerness etc.

Vardhamana[390]

Nature : There are two definitions of *Vardhamāna* given by Bharata. They are the same as the two (of the four) definitions of the *Niṣadha hasta.*[391]

Use : Their uses too, are identical. Sārṅgadeva, however, has given a different definition. Two *Haṁsapakṣa* hands in *svastika* which are turned away are termed *vardhamāna.*[392]

NRTTA HASTA

Caturasra[393]—Two *Khaṭakāmukha* hands level with the elbow and shoulders face forward in front of the chest, and are at a

distance of eight inches from it.

Udvṛtta or Tālavṛntaka[394]—*Vyāvartana* of *Haṁsapakṣa* hands.[395]

Tālamukha[396]—When two *caturasra* hands form themselves into the *Haṁsa pakṣa*, and are placed on their sides obliquely with palms facing each other, they are termed *Tālamukha*.

Svastika[397]—*Tālamukha* hands crossed on the wrist.

Viprakīrṇaka[398]—The same; suddenly separated.

Arālakhaṭakāmukha[399]—One hand is *Arāla*, and the other *khaṭakāmukha*.[400]

Āviddhavakra[401]—The foreparts of the arms, elbows and shoulders are turned around sportively, and the palms not facing each other are joined, i.e., the back of the palms are joined together.

Sūcīmukha[402]—The thumb and the middle finger[403] of the *Sarpaśiras* hands are joined together and kept obliquely.

OR

The thumb of the *Sarpaśiras* hand is kept in the middle of the palm and crossed in *Svastika*.

Recita[404]—Two hands extended palm upwards, are called *Recita*. Or, two *Haṁsapakṣa* hands making a quick circular movement are said to constitute *Recita*.

Ardha-recita[405]—Left hand is *Caturasra* and right hand *Recita*.

Uttānavañcita[406]—Hands are in *Tripatākā* kept obliquely and shoulders and elbows are slightly bent.[407]

Pallava[408]—Two *Patākā* hands are crossed in *svastika* on the wrist.

Nitamba[409]—The *Patākā* hands which from the region of the shoulder extend outwards and fall on the hip.[410]

Keśabandha[411]—Movement of hands from side to the region of the head (hair, literally) and back.[412]

Latā[413]—Arms extended obliquely at the sides.[414]

Karihasta[415]—One hand in *Latā* is swung from side to side, while the other is *Tripatākā* at the ear.

Pakṣavañcitaka[416]—The tip of a *Tripatākā* hand touches the hip and the tip of the other hand, which is in *Tripatākā* too, touches the head.

Pakṣapradyotaka[417]—The aforesaid hands kept with a *parivartana* movement.

Garuḍapakṣaka[418]—Bharata's definition does not make this at all clear. Abhinava's[419] exposition gives a better picture. Two hands placed near the hips with palms facing downwards, then having being joined at each other's bases, suddenly move up.

Daṇḍapakṣa[420]—*Haṁsapakṣa* hands, *vyāvartana—parivartana* movement, then arms extended.[421]

Ūrdhvamaṇḍala[422]—Hands perform the *vivartana* movement in the *ūrdhvadeśa* i.e. they are circled above.

Pārśvamaṇḍala[423]—Such aforesaid hands when placed on their respective sides are termed *Pārśvamaṇḍala.*

Uromaṇḍala[424]—One hand performs the *Udveṣṭita* and the other the *Apaveṣṭita* movement and then are circled[425] at the region.

Uroḥ Pārśvārdhamaṇḍala[426]—An *Arāla* and an *Ālapallava* are circled near the chest[427] and then perform the *āvartana* movement at the sides.

Muṣṭikasvastika[428]—Both hands at wrist, one is *kuñcita* i.e. *Arāla*,[429] the other *añcita* i.e. *Ālapallava.*[430] Then they form themselves into *Khaṭakāmukha* and finally *Svastika.*

Nalinīpadmakośa[431]—*Vyāvartana* and *Parivartana* of *Padmakośa* hands.

Ulbaṇa[432]—*Alapadma* hands with fingers quivering above.[433]

Lalita[434]—Two *Ālapallava* hands near the region of the head.

Valita[435]—Two hands which are in *Latā*, when crossed in *Svastika* at the elbows.

Footnotes

1 The *Abhinayadarpaṇa* (3-5) and *SR* clearly ascribe *tāṇḍava* to Taṇḍu. Kapila Vatsyayana, too, holds that according to the *NŚ* *tāṇḍava* was composed by Taṇḍu (Vatsyayana, K.. *Classical Indian Dance in Literature and the Arts*, Ch. 2, p. 29). *NŚ** 4 265 says the same—*Taṇḍunāpi tataḥ samyaggānabhāṇḍasamanvitaḥ| nṛttaprayogaḥ sṛṣṭo yaḥ tāṇḍava iti smṛtaḥ||* But from a perusal of *NŚ* 4.13-19 it seems that the dance itself (not just the *recakas, aṅgahāras* etc.) was composed by Lord Śiva himself and he merely instructed his protege Taṇḍu to teach it to Bharata—*mayā'pīdaṁ smṛtaṁ nṛttaṁ sandhyākāleṣu nṛtyatā| nānākaraṇasaṁyuktairaṅgahārairvibhūṣitam|| NŚ*, 4.13. Again *NŚ* 4.274 has *tasya taṇḍuprayuktasya tāṇḍavasya vidhikriyām* i.e., *tāṇḍava* was 'used' by Taṇḍu, not created' by him.

2 *NŚ*, 4. 15-16. Bharata had performed a *Ḍima* (i.e. a type of a play) named *Tripuradāha* before Lord Śiva, the *pūrvaraṅga* of which had no *nṛtta*. Hence, the concept of *nṛtta* in the *pūrvaraṅga* was introduced by Lord Śiva and this was called *citra pūrvaraṅga*, pro-

* The B.H.U. ed is used in this Chapter uptil fn. No. 61 (except fn. 8 to 17 where G.O.S. ed. is used).

bably because it gave a picturesque quality.

3 *Tvatprayuyukṣitaprayogocitoddhatapūrvaraṅgavidhau. Tatprayuktā ime karaṇāṅgahārāḥ. Sukumārapūrvaraṅge tu devyā kṛtā anuddhatā aṅgahārā ityabhiprāyāt. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.14; also *cf.* commentary on *NŚ*, 4.273.

4 *NŚ*, 4.274-95 make this quite plain. "*Tāṇḍava* has been translated by some as 'wild dance' (Hass. *Daśarūpa*, p. 5), but the adjective seems to be misleading. From the present chapter of the *NŚ* it appears that the word meant 'class dance' which has been codified. It is to be distinguished from folk dance mentioned in the later texts. *Tāṇḍava* was not exclusively a male dance. for the illustrations of the *karaṇas* taken out of old bas reliefs and printed in the Baroda ed. of the *NŚ* show that these were performed by women as well. These *karaṇas* were evidently elements of *tāṇḍava; lāsya* performed by women was only a gentle form of *tāṇḍava*." Ghosh, M.M., translation of the *NŚ*, p. 68 fn.

5 *Prāyeṇa tāṇḍavavidhirdevastutyāśrayo bhavet/* *NŚ*, 4.273.
Devastutyāśrayakṛtaṁ yadaṅgam tu bhavedatha/
Māheśvarairaṅgahārairuddhataistat prayojayet// Ibid., 4.320.

6 For details of *Vardhamānaka* see under *tāla* of *gāndharva* music.

7 *Recitenākṣiptarecitena ca samastānāmuktānāmanuktānām cādhārādyanantabhedānām niṣpattiḥ. Tathā ca Nandimata uktam—Recitākhyoṅgahāro yo dvidhā tena hyaśeṣataḥ/ tuṣyanti devatāstena tāṇḍave taṁ niyojayet// AB* on *NŚ*, 4.263.

8 *NŚ*, 31. 332-38; *AB*, ad *NŚ*, *l.c.* (G.O.S. ed.).

9 *NŚ*, 31. 339-41; *AB*, *ibid.* (G.O.S.).

10 *NŚ*, 31. 342-44; *AB*. *ibid.* (G.O.S.).

11 *NŚ*, 31. 345-48; *AB*, *ibid.* (G.O.S.).

12 *NŚ*, 31. 349-54; *AB*, *ibid.* (G.O.S.).

13 *NŚ*, 31. 355-57; *AB*, *ibid.* (G.O.S.).

14 *NŚ*, 31. 358-60; *AB*, *ibid.* (G.O.S.).

15 *NŚ*, 31. 361-62; *AB*, *ibid.* (G.O.S.).

16 *NŚ*, 31. 362-67; *AB*, *ibid.* (G.O.S.).

17 *NŚ*, 31. 364-67; *AB*, *ibid.* (G.O.S.).

18 In the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, the *tāṇḍava* is described as the dance taught to sage Bharata by Taṇḍu at the orders of Lord Śiva. *NŚ*, (B.H.U., ed. 1971, Vol. I), Ch. 4.

19 The *lāsya* form of dance is said to have been created by the goddess Pārvatī. *NŚ*, 4. 256.

20 *Piṇḍībandhāṁstato dṛṣṭvā Nandibhadramukhā gaṇāḥ/ Cakruste nāma piṇḍīnām bandhamāsāṁ salakaṣaṇam// —NŚ*, 4. 257. A later work, the *Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa* of Bhoja, says that Brahmā is the author

of the *piṇḍībandhas—piṇḍyādyā brahmaṇoṅgajāḥ* (Vol. II, pp. 425-426).

21 *Dvayoḥ prayoktṛtayā sukumārāsukumāranṛttayoḥ samakālaprayogeṇa piṇḍībandhaniṣpattiṁ sūcayati-Nandibhadramukhā gaṇā iti. AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 257.

22 *Evamanyasyāpi tathā devatāsu yathākramaṁ dhvajabhūtāḥ prayoktavyāḥ piṇḍībandhāḥ sucinhitāḥ/.* Kumbhā described *piṇḍībandha* as having the form of *piṇḍa* and rendered by imitation of the form of one's chosen deity. *Sa ceṣṭa-devatārūpānukaraṇena smṛto budhaiḥ lāsye cehānukāreṇa. Vidheyā cavispaścitā piṇḍīkāreṇa vijñeyāḥ piṇḍībandhāstadā punaḥ.* Kumbhā as quoted in *Bharatakośa*, p. 886

23 *NŚ*, 4. 258-62.

24 *Tatraite piṇḍībandhā ādhārāṅgaprayogasādhakatamabhedādbahuprakāram bhidyante. AB* (B.H.U. ed., Vol. I), p. 401.

25 .... *ādhāre svavapuṣyake ca vividhāṁ sṛṣṭiṁ samāsūtrayan/ trailokyasthapatistvameva bhagavanviśvākṛtirjṛmbhasi.* Quoted by *AB*, p. 402.

26 *Tatra deśaḥ kāla iti ādhāradvyabhedātsapta lokāḥ trayaḥ kālā ityādhārabhedāḥ daśa. Hastau pādau akṣiṇī śira ityaṅgabhedā api sapteti saptadaśa. Ekoneko vā prayoktā, so' pi samaprayogo viṣamaprayogo veti caturdhākaraṇena sampadyate aṅgahāreṇa veti pūrvāṇi caturbhiḥ paścāt saptadaśena ca guṇanādaṣṭādhikacatuḥśatyadhikaṁ dvisahasram pārameśvarāḥ piṇḍībandhāḥ. AB*, p. 401.

27 *Karaṇa* is a sequence of dance movements culminating in pose.

28 *Aṅgahāra* is a sequence of *karaṇas*.

29 *Piṇḍī ādhāraṅgādisaṁghātaḥ tayā bādhyate buddhau praveśyate tanubhāvena sakalāya vā vyomādirūpāyeti piṇḍībandha ākṛtiviśeṣaḥ.... Ākāro badhyate sampadyate punaraneneti piṇḍībandhaḥ karaṇāṅgahārādiḥ. Ibid.*, p. 403.

It is pertinent to quote here a note given on *piṇḍībandha* in the *Tāṇḍavalakṣaṇam* (Appendix F) :

"The term *piṇḍī* is explained in a long note in the commentary. The word literally means the cavity in the plinth of an idol into which the latter's lower portion fits smugly for stability. The connotation of the expression seems to have expanded through successive stages until in the end it came to embrace such abstract concepts as 'the prime attribute', 'the root cause' etc.

"*Piṇḍībandha* meant at first the concrete symbol which was created in the course of a deity's dance (for example, the ecstatic dance of Śiva) and thereafter came to be associated with and signify that deity. We may cite here as an example the *liṅga*. This form

was created by Śiva when he danced his impassioned *aṅgahāras*, and it emphasises the unified masculine-faminine nature of the supreme God-head. Śiva is formless and the *liṅga*, which is the nearest approach to the formlessness of a concrete symbol, represents his masculine aspect, and the pedestal which receives this *liṅga* represents the feminine aspect.

"*Piṇḍī* may also mean the *aṅgahāras* and *karaṇas* introduced in the dance to signify a particular deity. The meaning now expands to include the consort, the *vāhana*, the weapon, and other implements of that deity.

"*Piṇḍī* also means the favourite *karaṇa* of a deity with which he is appeased. Īśvarī, for example is pleased when *talapuṣpapuṭa karaṇa* is danced. Īśvara is propitiated by the *niśumbhita*.

"Whenever any deity is to be indicated the dances appproppriate to his nature are to be performed. In the intervals between one such dance and another the dance appropriate to his *piṇḍī* are to be danced.

"Finally, *piṇḍī* appears to stand for any characteristic attribute of a deity (for example, personal beauty of Lakṣmī, continuous flow of Gaṅgā, etc.)."

30 ......*talapuṣpapuṭa-karaṇena karmaviśeṣasūcakena Bhagavatyāḥ paritoṣaṇam sampadyate. 'Tilake ca karaḥ sthāpyaḥ' ityabhinayena Bhagavataḥ paritoṣaḥ. 'Nikuṭṭitau yadā hastau' ityanena triśūlā-kṛtiryā kāyasampattiḥ. Garuḍaplutakena tārkṣyākaragatisūcanam. Gaṅgāvatāreṇa dhārāpiṇḍī. Nāgāpasarpitena bhogipiṇḍī. 'Prasāryotkṣipya ca karau' ityaṅgahāreṇa ākārīyabhasmatriśūlaśivaliṅgādipiṇḍīniṣpattiḥ. Ibid.*. p. 405.

31 *Piṇḍīnām vidhyaścaiva catvāraḥ samprakīrtitāḥ/ Piṇḍī śṛṅkhalikā caiva latābandho' tha bhedyakaḥ// NŚ*, 4.292.

32 *Piṇḍībandhāstu piṇḍatvāt gulmaḥ śṛṅkhalikā bhavet/ jālopanaddhā ca latā sanṛtto bhedyakaḥ smṛtaḥ// NŚ*, 4.293.

33 Vatsyayana, K., *op. cit.*, pp. 33-4.

34 *Tatra viśeṣāntarahitam hṛdyamekaprayojyam piṇḍībandharūpamityekaḥ prakāroviśeṣanāmadheyavirahātsāmānyaśabdenoktaḥ Tadāha—piṇḍībandhaḥ piṇḍatvāditi. Nartakīdvayayojyaḥ paraspara-sambandha eva piṇḍībandhadvyaprakāraḥ sajātīyo vā ekanālāvabaddhakamalayugalavat vijātīyo vā haṁsavadanaparigṛhītanālanalinavat gulmaḥ śṛṅkhalikāśabdavācyaḥ. Nartakītrayaprayojyāstu tato'pi vaicitryasahiṣṇutvājjālavadvicitratāṁ gacchatpūrvavatsajātīyavijātīyātmalatābandhāḥ. Nartakīcatuṣṭayaprayojyāstu......jñāto bhedyakaḥ. AB*, pp. 462-3. "They are done by one or more *nartakīs*......That done by one is a simple *piṇḍī*. The pattern executed by two looks like two

lotuses on a stalk, or a swan holding by its beak a lotus stalk with the lotus. This *piṇḍī* by two is called a *gulma* or *śṛṅkhalikā*, the pattern formed by three is *jāla*, by four *latābandha*." Raghavan, V., *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa*, p. 588.

35 *Piṇḍībandhaḥ kaniṣṭhe tu śṛṅkhalā tu layāntare/ Madhyame ca latābandhaḥ jyeṣṭhe caivātha bhedyakaḥ // NŚ*. 4.294. For meaning of *āsārita* see fn. 43. For details Chapter on *tāla*.

36 *Ekā tu prathamaṁ yojyā dve dvitīyaṁ tathaiva ca/ Tisro vastu tṛtīyam tu catusrastu caturthakam// NŚ*, 4.291.

37 "Of these the *gulma* is a general collective dance, the *śṛṅkhalā* is the dance in which partners hold one another's hands, the *latā* is the dance of two putting their arms around each other, and *bhedyaka* is the dance of each one separately away from the group." Ghosh, M.M., translation of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, p. 71.

38 Vatsyayana, K., *op.cit.*, p. 34.

39 *L.c.*

40 *L.c.*

41 For *sajātīya* and *vijātīya piṇḍībandhas* see fn. 34.

42 *NŚ*, 4. 276-94.

43 *Āsāritam gītam*, Kavi, Ram Krishna, *Bharatakośa*, p. 64. *Āsārita* is a kind of music in many parts and with a fixed and elaborate *tāla* or beat structure for each part. Its parts, *mukha*, *pratimukha*, *deha* aad *saṁharaṇa* were compared with *udgītha*, *prastāra*, *pratihāra* and *nidhana* respectively of *sāman* singing. Some compare a further *āsārita* component, the *śirṣaka* with the *Sāmic* part called *upadrava*. *L.c.* Four *āsāritas* with different *tāla*-structure have been described in the *NŚ*. These are in order the *Kaniṣṭha*, *Layāntara*, *Madhyama* and *Jyeṣṭha* respectively. These were distinguished by the number of beats they required. (The connection of *piṇḍībandha* with *āsārita* is mentioned elsewhere too. *Prayogastu yadā tveṣām piṇḍībandhairvikalpyate/ pratyekam hyaṅgavinyāsastadā teṣām pṛthak-pṛthak// —NŚ*, (G.O.S. ed.), 31. 77.

44 *Upohana* was rendered in the first few initial *kalās* or beats of the *mukha* part of the *āsārita*. *NŚ* (G.O.S. ed.), 31. 79.

45 *Prayujya gītavādye tu niṣkrāmennartakī, tataḥ/ anenaiva vidhānena praviśantyaparāḥ pṛthak// —NŚ*, 4. 283. *Anyāścānukrameṇātha piṇḍīm badhnanti yāḥ striyaḥ/ tāvatparyastakaḥ kāryo yāvatpiṇḍī na badhyate// —NŚ*, 4. 284. Abhinava explains that *niṣkrāma* here does not mean that the dancer will totally leave the stage, but simply that she will follow another. *Sā niṣkrāmedapasaret, na tu sarvathaiva nirgacchet. Dve dvitīyamiti Vakṣyamāṇatvāt. Aparāḥ kim yugapat-praviśanti netyāha. Pṛthak ekaikakrameṇa praviśedityar-*

thaḥ. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 279.

46 *Tathā hi ekam tu prathamamityatra prathamāsāritamabhinayati. Tato Dvitīyā dvitīyāsāritam. Tatsamakālam tu prathamā kevalam-aṅgahāram karotīti. Evam tṛtīyāsāritārthamabhinayati. Tadā dve aṅgahāram prayuñjate. Caturthī caturthāsāritābhinayaṁ yadā karoti tisr'oṅgahāram rañjayanti. Anye tvabhinayaprayoga pi sahitatāmāhuḥ*. *AB* on *NŚ* 4. 294.

47 *Piṇḍīm badhvā tataḥ sarvā niṣkrāmeyuḥ striyastu tāḥ/*
piṇḍībandheṣu vādyam tu kartavyamiha vādakaiḥ// —*NŚ*, 4. 285.

48 *AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 112. *Cf*. Kavi, Ram Krishna, *Bharatakośa*, p. 416.

49 *Ibid*., pp. 588-89.

50 *NŚ*, 31. 188.

51 *Ibid*., 31. 88.

52 *Sūcābhinayaḥ*
Bhaviṣyadarthānugamādvākyārtho vākyameva tataḥ/
Sūcābhinayano nāṭye vedibhiḥ pratipāditaḥ//
—Vemabhūpala quoted by Kavi, Ram Krishna, *Bharatakośa*, p. 969. I.e. that is known as *sūcābhinaya* where *vākya* or meaning connected with future events is indicated first by *āṅgika* and then by vocal acting.

53 Sequence of ten *karaṇas*.—Kavi, Ram Krishna, *Bharatakośa*, p. 310; *SR*, Vol. IV, pp. 806-7.

54 *AB* (B.H.U. ed.), Vol. I, pp. 435-37.

55 *Anekanartakīyojyam citratālalayānvitam ācatuṣṣaṣṭhiyugalādrāsakaṁ masṛṇoddhatam*. *Ibid*., p. 437.
It may be noted that *piṇḍībandha* arose out of *sukumāra* and *asukumāra nṛttas*.

56 *Śoḍoṣadvādas' astau vā yasminnṛtyanti nāyikā piṇḍībandhādivinyāsaiḥ rāsakaṁ tadudāhṛtam*.—Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa*, Vol. I, pp. 425.

57 *Latākhyabhedyakaiḥ gulmaiḥ nānāpravṛtta-pradarśakaiḥ pātrairekatva-saṁyuktaṁ piṇḍībandham tu kārayeta*. *Ibid*., p. 427.

58 *Paribhramantyaḥ vicitrabandhaiḥ ima dviśo' sanartakyaḥ khelanti tālānugatapādāḥ tavāṅgaṇe dṛśyate daṇḍarāsaḥ—Karpūramañjarī*, 4.10.

59 *Maṇḍalena tu yannṛttam hallīsakamiti smṛtam ekastatra tu netā syādgopastrīṇāṁ yathā hariḥ*. *AB* (B.H.U. ed., Vol. I), p. 437.

60 The use of *piṇḍībandha* in the *pūrvaraṅga* appears to have become obscure by the time of Abhinava, although he clearly knew the practice. It is possible that it had fallen out of use in the dramatic tradition but continued in the folk tradition. This is suggested by these lines—

Nanu sarvo'yam piṇḍībandhaprakāra ihopayogī vā na vetyāśaṅkyāho ......na cāyam piṇḍībandhaprakāra lakṣye vicchinnaḥ. Kevalamṛttṛṇa-kakṣayoḥ patitamahauṣadhivad anavasthitairabhyuddhartuṁ na śakyate sāvadhānatayā tu śakyata eveti nātrālasyaṁ śrayitavyam anyathā katham prayogamāhuḥ. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 295.

61 It should be remembered that in folk culture full creativity is not standardised *per se*. While standard forms are created out of it, in itself the folk tradition varies continuously. The relationship of the dialects to the standard language illustrates the relationship of folk forms to classical forms in arts.

*62 *NŚ*, (G.O.S. ed.) 10. 51.

63 *Ibid.*, 10. 52-58.

64 *Ibid.*, 10. 90-93.

65 *AB* on *NŚ*, 10. 53.

66 *NŚ*, 10. 58-61.

67 *Ibid.* 10. 61-65.

68 How Kapila Vatsyayana (*op. cit.*, p. 78) holds that the two feet are "two *tālas* and half apart" is not understandable.

69 *NŚ*, 10. 65-67.

70 According to Śārṅgadeva the feet are at the distance of only one *tāla* from each other. But he further says that according to some the feet are kept at a distance of four *tālas* probably hinting at Bharata. *SR* (Adyar ed.). Vol. IV, 1046.

71 *NŚ*, 10. 67-70.

72 *Ibid.*, 10. 70-72. Bharata has not named the presiding deity for the *Pratyālīḍha* and Śārṅgadeva has given it as Rudra, the same as that of *Ālīḍha*. *SR*, Vol. IV, 1052-53.

73 *NŚ*, 12. 160. Śārṅgadeva besides enumerating these three gives four more, *Gatāgata*, *Valita*. *Moṭita* and *Vinivartita* that is seven in all. He also gives the presiding goddesses for each, which Bharata does not.

74 *NŚ*, 12. 162-67. Śārṅgadeva seems to be stressing on the fact that this *sthāna* is to be assumed on entry to stage i.e. in the *pūrvaraṅga* and even quotes Abhinava's view on it. *SR* Vol. IV, 1057-62.

75 *NŚ*, 10. 167-72.

76 *Ibid.*, 10. 172-75.

77 *Ibid.*, 10. 8-10.

78 *Ibid*, 10. 11-13.

79 *Ibid.*, 10. 14.

80 *Ibid.*, 10. 15.

---

* From this point the references are to the G.O.S ed. unless otherwise stated.

81 *Ibid.*, 10. 16.
82 *Ibid.*, 10, 17.
83 *Pṛṣṭhata iti pārṣṇipradeśe*—*AB* on *NŚ* 10. 17.
84 *Tasyeti dakṣinasyāpasarpaṇe svapārśvārdhatryaśritatayā sthitiḥ Ibid.*
85 *NŚ*, 10. 18.
86 *Atha cāṣagatiḥ savya iti savyopasarpatyeva sarvatra. Prasārita iti tālamātramagrataḥ punaḥ sa evāpasarpito dvitālamātram paścānnītaḥ. vāmaḥ savyena sahāpasarpati. Kiñcidutplutya savyavāmāpasarpataḥ ślisyataśceti tatrasamapasarpaṇādau caṣasyeva gatiḥ cāṣagatiḥ. savyopasarpicetyanye paṭhanti tatra savyosarpaśabdayoḥ śliṣṭatvamapasarpaṇam cārthaḥ AB* on *NŚ*, 10.18.
87 *NŚ*, 10.19.
88 *Ibid.*, 10.20.
89 Abhinava says that since this is like the movement of a goat, it is termed thus, for *elaka* means goat. *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.20.
90 *NŚ*, 10.21.
91 *Ibid.*, 10.22.
92 *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.22.
93 *NŚ*, 10.23.
94 The other foot is in *sama* position says Abhinava—*athāḍḍitā....... tena samasthita eko'gratalasañcāraḥ pādaḥ dvitīyaḥ. AB* on *NŚ*, 10.23.
95 *NŚ*, 10.24.
96 *Recakam nṛttahastamātram kecidāhuḥ. AB* on *NŚ*, 10.24.
97 *NŚ*, 10.25.
98 *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.25.
99 *NŚ*, 10.26.
100 *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.26.
101 *NŚ*, 10.26.
102 *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.26.
103 *NŚ*, 10.27.
104 *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.27.
105 *NŚ*, 10.28.
106 *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.28.
107 *NŚ*, 10.30.
108 *Athatikrānta .....kuñcitaṁ tad dvitīyagulphakṣetre kṛtvā kiñcit purataḥ prasārya prakṛtibhedena catustalāntaramutkṣipyāgreṇa bhūmau nipātyata iti gantavyā tikramādatikrāntā. AB* on *NŚ* 10.30.
109 *NŚ*, 10.31.
110 *Athāpakrantā ūrubhyām valanalakṣitam (baddhnam) pūrvam kṛtvā tataḥ pādamuddhṛtya pārśve kṣipedityapakramaṇādapakrāntā. AB* on *NŚ*, 10.31.

111 *NŚ*. 10.32.
112 *Atha pārśvakrāntā kuñcitam pādaṁ svapārśveṇopari nītvā bhūmau pārṣṇyā pātayediti*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.32.
113 Having just stood in *agratalasañcara*, the heel is dropped to the ground, i.e. *talasañcara-añcita* movement. *NŚ*, 9.266.
114 *NŚ*, 10.33.
115 *Ibid*., 10.34.
116 *Atha sūcī—jānūrdhvaṁ janūparyantaṁ jaṅghāṁ prasārayet, yadi vā janorūrdhvamūruparyantāṁ jaṅghām sakalām prasāryāgrayogenapātayediti*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.34.
117 *NŚ*, 10.35.
118 *Atha nūpurapādikā*.........*añcitam kṛtvā tam pṛṣṭhataḥ sphikapārṣṇiśleṣaparyantaṁ nītvā svapārśvegratalenāñcitam jaṅghāyām pātayediti* *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.35.
119 *NŚ*, 10.36.
120 *Ibid*., 10.37.
121 *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.37.
122 *NŚ*, 10.38.
123 *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.38.
124 *NŚ*, 10.39.
125 *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.39.
126 *NŚ*, 10.40.
127 *Ibid*., 10.41.
128 *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.41.
129 *NŚ*, 10.42.
130 *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.42.
131 *NŚ*, 10.43.
132 *AB* on *NŚ* 10.43.
133 *SR*, Vol. IV, pp. 948-49.
134 *Ūru-jānu-jaṅghasya stabdhatvena daṇḍākāvatvāt daṇḍapādā*. *AB* (G O.S. ed.), Vol. II, p. 105.
135 *NŚ*, 10.45.
136 *AB* on *NŚ*, 10.45.
137 *NŚ*, 4.61. Abhinava explains – The right foot is extended through the *Adhyardhikā Cārī*, the two hands are brought to the right side with the *vyāvartana* movement and then with the *parivartana* to the left side. Then beneath the left and right breasts is formed the *puṣpapuṭa karaṇa* through the combination of *talasañcara* foot and *puṣpapuṭa* hand. The *limbs* are in *sauṣṭhava*. He also gives the purpose of the *karaṇa*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.61.

Essential part of the dance is the *pūrvaraṅga*. This *karaṇa* is connected with Pārvatī and is used for appeasing the Goddess. *Ata*

eva "pādāgrasthitayā" ityatra talapuṣpapuṭakaraṇena karmaviśeṣa-sūcakena bhagavatyāḥ paritoṣaṇam sampadyate. AB on *NŚ*, 4.263.

138 Bharata simply mentions the *svastika* at the wrists and the *vyāvartana* and *parivartana* movements, *NŚ*, 4.62.

Abhinava explains thus—After having formed the *svastika* (i.e. hand crossed at the wrists) in front of the chest but separate from it, the *vyāvartita* and *parivartita* movements should be made, and the hands made to fall palm on the thigh. If two *uttāna patākā* hands are made to fall it represents jealousy; *patākā* hands with palms turned down and rubbed indicate anger. Thus, in this *karaṇa* there can be other poses too like *kaṭakamukha, śukatuṇḍa* etc. in accordance with different applications. According to some there is *agratala-sañcara. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.62.

139 *NŚ*, 4. 63. Bharata mentions the *vyāvartana*. *parivartana* and *śukatuṇḍa* of the hands and the *valita* inward position of the thighs. Abhinava says—The hands make the *vyāvartita* and *parivartita* movements simultaneously from the chest and with the *ākṣiptā cārī* are brought together through the *parivartana* movement and placed there (i.e. on the chest adopting the *śukatuṇḍa* pose with the palm facing down. The movement is by *ākṣipitā cārī* and stasis by *baddhā cārī*. (It may be noted that there is *valana* of the thighs in *baddhā cārī)*. This *karaṇa* is used to represent the bashfulness of a shy and artless girl. *AB* on *NŚ*, *l.c.*

140 *NŚ*, 4. 64.

141 Abhinava mentions the *ākṣiptā cārī*. He also says that this *karaṇa* is used to indicate jealousy and anger.

142 *NŚ*, 4. 65.

143 Abhinava explains that the '*pralambita*' arms of Bharata mean *latā* pose—i.e. the arms are extended obliquely.
pralambitau karāviti latāhastau mantavyau na tu dolāhastau. AB on *NŚ*, 4. 65.

144 *NŚ*, 4. 66. Abhinava says that the *ūrdhvamaṇḍala (nṛtta hasta)* movements is first made and then the *añjali* pose (which Bharata mentions) on the chest. He says that this *karaṇa* is used in indicating the entreaties of a lover. It is not used for *praṇāma* to the gods, because that is done by the *añjali* pose of hands near the head. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.66.

145 After taking the *caturasra* pose the hands form the *recita* movement, i.e. *haṁsapakṣa hasta* making a quick circular movement, then *āviddhavakra* i.e, with *vyāvṛtta* movements, arms are brought down and up from the region of the head, then from *svastika* (at the chest). Then they are separated and form the *pakṣavañcita*

and *pakṣapradyota nṛtta-hastas* at the *hips*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.67.

146 *NŚ*, 4.68. Abhinava expounds thus—Having adopted the *caturasra* pose of the hands, while performing the *vicyavā cārī*, the hands should make the *ūrdhvamaṇḍala* gesture preceded by the *udveṣṭita* movement, and then make the *svastika*. The *sthāna* adopted should be *maṇḍala*. This *karaṇa* is used for indicating scorn or contempt. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.68.

147 *NŚ*, 4.69. Bharata simply states that there is *nikuṭṭana* of the hands and feet. Abhinava explains thus—*Nikuṭṭana* of the hand is the falling and rising of the little finger in the *ālapadama hasta*. *Nikuṭṭana* of the feet is the same thing as *udghaṭṭita* feet (i.e. toe heel movement). Thereafter he explains the sequence—Assuming the *maṇḍala sthāna* and standing with the *caturasra nṛtta hastas*, the right hand is brought with an *udveṣṭita* movement to the hump of the right shoulder, and *nikuṭṭana* (with the little finger of the *ālapadama hasta*) is done there. The right foot does *nikuṭṭana* by the *udghaṭṭita* action. Then, the left hand is made to do the *āviddhavakra* movement, once again the *caturasra nṛtta hastas* are formed and *nikuṭṭana* done. Similarly the left foot does the *udghaṭṭita* movement. This is employed to indicate self-adultation. *AB* on *NŚ*. 4.69.

148 *Nikuṭṭana* of only one side. *NŚ*, 4.70.

149 *NŚ*, 4.71. Bharata simply mentions the *chinna kaṭi* or waist and the *pallava* hands. Abhinava explains—Loosely formed *pātākā hastas* at the waist are called *pallava*. Thus the shadow both of *patākā* and *ālapallava*. *Valana* of the waist is a *chinna kaṭi*. Thereafter he explains the *karaṇa*—Having executed the *bhrāmarī cārī* (on either side) the *maṇḍala sthāna* is assumed, and the *pallava-hasta* is formed at the shoulder. The same is done on the other side. This has to be repeated three or four times. This *karaṇa* is used to express wonder. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.71.

150 *NŚ*, 4.72. Abhinava expounds thus—Having assumed the *maṇḍala sthāna* one hand as *khaṭakāmukha* is held near the chest, and the other moves away and then forms the *sūcīmukha* near it. The foot performs the *nikuṭṭana* movement and side is *sannata*. Indicates bemusement. *AB* on *NŚ*. 4.72.

151 *NŚ*, 4.73. Abhinava explains—After the *caturasra* hands are placed at the chest, they (the hands) execute the *recita* movement. Then with the *vyāvartita* movement they are brought to the chest which is bent forward (*abhugna*) and the hands are crossed in *svastika*. The legs are also crossed in *svastika*. This *karaṇa* is used to indicate bashfulness and repentence. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.73.

152 *NŚ*, 4.74.

153 Abhinava prescribes the *āviddhā cārī—āviddhā cāryā cāsya prayogaḥ* It is used for indicating pride born of wealth—*etasyātisaubhāgyādi-janitagarvaviṣayaḥ prayogaḥ*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.74.

154 *NŚ*, 4.75.

155 There is a jump and then *svastika* of the hands and feet are formed—*yugapadeva hastapādasya svastikam racayet.....* *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.75.

156 *NŚ*, 4.76. Abhinava expounds—While the two arms are extended in *udveṣṭita* movement, the *apakrāntā cārī* is executed. While the *apaveṣṭita* movement is performed the other foot performs the *sūcī cārī*. Then the *svastika* is formed with the feet and hands. Due to the turning of the *trika*, the *svastika* is at the back and hence this is called *pṛṣṭha svastika*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.76.

157 Amara defines *trika* as 'the lower portion of the spine where it meets the pelvic bones'.

158 *NŚ*, 4.77.

159 *AB on NŚ*. 4.77.

160 *NŚ*, 4.78. Abhinava explains—the *alātā cārī* is performed with the right foot and the right hand executing the *nitamba nṛtta hasta* (the extending of hands from the shoulder) the *caturasra nṛtta hastas* are assumed. The left leg performs the *ūrdhvajānu cārī*. This *karaṇa* is employed in *lalita nṛtta* i.e. the *lāsya* style of dancing. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.78.

161 *NŚ*, 4.79. The text of Bharata does not at all give a clear picture of this *karaṇa*. Since it is named *kaṭisama*, there should be a movement of the waist; but how ? This is explained by Abhinava. He says that after performing the *ākṣiptā* and *apakrāntā cārīs* and having formed a *svastika* with the hands, the two hands are placed thus—One on the navel as *khaṭakāmukha hasta*, the other an *ardhacandra hasta* is placed on the other side of the waist. This side of the waist is in the *nata* pose and the other is raised. When accompained by the *vaiṣṇava sthāna*, this is called *kaṭisama*. It is used by the *sūtradhāra* at the consecration of the *jarjara* in the *pūrvaraṅga*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.79.

162 Abhinava takes *udvāhita* to betoken a raised side and not *udvāhita* chest as usually interpreted. Cf. Kapila Vatsyayana, *op. cit.* p. 141. *Udvāhita* chest here seems to be irrelevant. In fact, Abhinava describes here the *nata* and *udvāhita* of the waist which seems a more appropriate interpretation for the *karaṇa* termed *kaṭisama*.

163 *NŚ* 4.80. Abhinava expounds thus—The two hands placed near the heart make a *vyāvṛtta* movement all around i.e. high up and

and are thrown down at the sides. Then, one hand forming the *recita* movement i.e. *haṁsapakṣa hasta* with a quick circular movement is brought downwards to the chest. The other hand in a *recita* movement too, is taken away (from the body). The feet are *añcita* and *sūcī*. This is used in representing a series of giving and receiving. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.80.

164 *NŚ*, 4.81. While one hand performs the *vyāvṛtta* movement, the foot on the same side is stretched out (*vikṣepa*). The other hand is in the *caturasra* pose. Then the former hand makes the *parivartana* movement, and the foot is brought back *(ākṣepa)*. This *karaṇa* is used to represent going and coming. However, Abhinava says that the application of this *karaṇa* is to be in between pieces of *abhinaya*, in moving about, in the course of *cārīs* and *sthānakas* which are used while fighting is being shown and for indicating arrangement for keeping time i.e. *tāla AB* on *NŚ*, 4.81.

165 *NŚ*. 4.82.

166 Abhinava says that the left hand is *khaṭakāmukha vāmiti khaṭakasyam.... pādabhyāmevasvastikayogādardhasvastikam*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.82.

167 *NŚ*, 4.83.

168 *Sa eveti yo' rdhasvastikakaraṇe karihasta uktaḥ sa eva vyāvartitakaraṇena yadā nāsākṣetre ālapallavakṛtitvā-dañcita-sāraṇānukārī tadañcitam. AB* on *NŚ*, 4 83. Abhinava says that when with the *vyāvṛtta* and *parivartita* movements the *karihasta* (which as used in *ardha svastika*) is brought near the nose and forms the *ālapallava hasta*, then it is the *añcita karaṇa*. Kapila Vatsyayana has classified this *karaṇa* alongwith the *pāda* or feet *karaṇas*. Neither Bharata nor Abhinava mentions the *añcita*-foot. Bharat clearly says, *añcito nāsikāgre*...i.e. *añcita* at the nose-tip. It is obvious that the *añcita* foot cannot be brought near the nose. Obviously therefore it refers to the hand. From the *AB* it is clear that this means the *ālapallava hasta*. The *SR* (Vol. IV, pp. 591-5), too, mentions the *ālapadma hasta* and has not mentioned the *añcita* foot anywhere. It may be noted that in *karaṇas* 9, 71, 104, 105 where the *añcita* hand has been mentioned it denotes the *ālapallava hasta*. The *svastika* foot which Dr. Vatsyayana refers has not been mentioned anywhere (*op. cit.* p. 143).

169 *NŚ*, 4.84.

170 .. *hastau tu pādavaśādvyāvartitaparivartitau bhavataḥ. Krameṇaiko dolāhastau paraḥ khaṭakāsya iti*, *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.84.

170[a] In fact. there is an oblique turning of the entire body specially knees, thighs and waist.

171 *NŚ*, 4.85.

172 The hand movement has not been specified in the *NŚ*. But Abhinava says one hand forms the *arāla* above the knee, the other is a *khaṭakāmukha hasta* near the chest—*eko hastaḥ kuñcitastanasamajānūparivodhvamukhorarālo vā. tatrāparastu vakṣasthaḥ khaṭakāmukhaḥ*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.85.

173 *NŚ*, 4.86.

174 *Vṛścikākhye karaṇe yaḥ pādo vakṣyate pādaḥ pṛṣṭhāñcitastathā iti (NŚ*, 4.108)*; sa vṛścikaśabdenehocyate. Tena paścātprasāritam caraṇam kṛtvā tadekam ca caraṇaṁ kṛtvā tadekam ca hastaṁ śiraḥ pārśvakṣetre' rālam dvitīyaṁ ca nāsāgrakṣetrānusāri vakṣasyarālameva kuryāt.—AB* on *NŚ*, 4.86.

175 *NŚ*, 4.87. The *mattālli cārī* is used here. Abhinava expounds thus—Having made a *svastika* with the ankles, the feet move away. Simultaneously with the *svastika* movement the feet is the *udveṣṭita* movement of the hands and the forming of the *nitamba nṛtta hasta*. At the time of the *upasarpaṇa* or moving away of the feet. the *āveṣṭita* of the hands is executed. This *karaṇa* is used to represent intoxication. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.87.

176 *NŚ*, 4.88.

177 *SR*, Vol. IV, 631-32 mentions *nitamba* and *keśabandha nṛtta hastas* in context of the right hand.

178 *NŚ*, 4.89.

179 *Ibid.*, 4.90.

180 Kapila Vatsyayana takes this to be *sūcīviddhā cārī (op cit.*, p. 143*)*. It may be pointed out that firstly there is no single *cārī* of such a name—*sūcī* and *āviddha* are two different *cārīs*. Secondly, a close perusal of the verse in the text will show that it is grammatically not possible to break up '*'sūcīviddhāvapakrāntau* (*NŚ*, 4.90) into *sūcīviddhau* and *apakrāntā*. It is *sūcīviddhau* and *apakrātau*. *Sūcīviddhau* is clearly explained by Abhinava as one foot *sūcī* and the other *viddha* i.e. pierced by it and thereafter *apakrāntā cārī—sūcākhyena pādena dvitīyam padaṁ viddhaṁ vidhāya sa eva sūcīpādopakrāntacārīyuktaḥ kāryaḥ*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.90. This fact is again exphasized when he clearly defines the *sūcī* as a foot movement not *sūcī* or *sūcīviddha* (?) *cārī*. Abhinava says—*Utṣkiptā tu bhavetpārṣṇiraṇgāgreṇā saṁsthitaḥ.*

181 *NŚ*, 4.91.—Abhinava explains—The hand indicated here is the *sūcīmukha*. That is moved away from the body. Simultaneously the *sūcī* foot which had been formed is also moved away. Then by the *bhrāmarī cārī*, there is turning of the *trika*. ...... *Sūcīmukho hastaḥ, sa dehakṣetrādapasṛtaḥ kāryaḥ. Tatsamakālaṁ sūcīpādo' py-*

aśritaḥ Tato bhrāmarikām cārīm kṛtvā......tadidam trikvalanadvalitam. AB on *NŚ*, 4.91.

182 *NŚ*, 4.92.

183 *Ibid.*, 4.93.

184 Abhinava mentions the *nitamba* and *keśa-bandha nṛtta hastas* in context of *vivartana* of the right hand (*AB* on *NŚ*. 4.93). So does Śārṅgadeva—'*nitamba-keśabandhādivartano dakṣiṇaḥ karaḥ. SR*, Vol. IV, p. 634.

185 *NŚ*, 4.94.

186 *Ibid.*, 4.95.

187 *Ibid.*, 4.96.

188 Abhinava mentions the *bhrāmarī cārī* in context of the turning of the *trika*—*tena bhrāmarikayā cāryā trikvalanam kṛtyā tato nūpurapādikām cārīm yena padena karoti. Taddikenaiva hastena recitam. Dvitīyo latāhastaḥ. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.96.

189 *NŚ*, 4.97.

190 *Ibid.*, 4.98. Kapila Vatsyayana mentions the *bhrāmarī cārī* for this *karaṇa* (*op. cit.*, p. 125). The turning of the *trika* and the name of the *karaṇa* itself do suggest the *bhrāmarī cārī*, but neither Abhinava nor Śārṅgadeva have mentioned the *bhrāmarī cārī*. Instead, they refer to the *ākṣiptā cārī* here. The *ākṣipta* and *svastika* feet have been mentioned by Bharata, and it is true that the *ākṣiptā cārī* uses both the *ākṣipta* movement and finally *svastika* of the feet. Perhaps, the *bhrāmarī cārī* was performed after that. According to Abhinava, *udveṣṭita* indicates *ulbaṇa nṛtta hastas*. The technique as explained by Abhinava seems to be thus—The foot is in the *ākṣiptā cārī*. Simultaneously the *udveṣṭita* hand movement is performed. The lower part of the spine is curved and the feet form *svastika*. The same is performed on the other side. The hand assume the *udveṣṭita* that is *ulbaṇa nṛtta hastas*—*Pādamakṣiptacārikam tadaivodveṣṭitam karam*, *SR*, Vol. IV, p. 641-42. *Tenaiva yojanā-svastikānantaraṁ pādamakṣipya ratsamakālamudveṣṭya.....udveṣṭitamekam hastam kṛtvā punardvitīyenaṅgena tathaiva cakarāntādva lanāntaram svastika eva pādaḥ. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.75.

191 *NŚ*, 4.99.

192 Abhinava explains that *añcita* should be taken to mean *ālapallava*—*añcita ityālapallava. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.99. He further says that this *karaṇa* is used to represent the actions of the *vidūṣaka* that produce wonder—*etadvidūṣakasya savismayasūcyabhinayādau. l.c.*

193 *NŚ*, 4.100.

194 *Ibid.*, 4.101.

195 Abhinava explains that the hands indicated by Bharata in this

karaṇa are *daṇḍapakṣa* and the *cārī daṇḍapādādaṇḍavaddhastavikṣepeṇa recanena ca daṇḍapakṣau sūcyete. Pādavikṣepaṇa tu daṇḍapādā cārī. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.101.

196 *NŚ*. 4. 102.

197 Abhinava explains the *vṛścika* foot as thigh rotated backwards and the sole of the foot turned upwards. Hands are *ālapallava*. It is used to represent wonder, desire for aerial movement, etc. *Pṛṣṭhabhāge recitajaṅghāmuttānatalam vṛściko' palakṣitam caraṇam kṛtvā dvāvapi hastau svabāhuśirasyālapallavau. AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 102.

198 *NŚ*, 4. 103. Abhinava expounds thus—Having performed the *sūcī cārī*, the left foot quickly moves away. The right foot is placed on the side. Simultaneously with the twisting of the back, the *recaka* movement is made with the hips. Or, the *bhrāmarī cārī* is executed and the *vyāvṛtta* and the *parivartita* movements made with the hands which finally form themselves into the *caturasra hastas*. It is used in moving about and also to fill up the pauses in music in between the *tālas* i.e. various time measures in music. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 103.

199 *NŚ*, 4. 104.

200 *Vāmaṁ caraṇam bhūmau. AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 104.

201 *NŚ*, 4. 105. Abhinava explains that in *kaṭiccheda* the raising and lowering of the heels as also the sides is performed. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 105.

202 *NŚ*, 4. 106.

203 *Ibid.*, 4. 107.

204 *Añcita* has been explained here as *karihasta* by Abhinava —*Hastasya bāhuśirasyañcanena karihasta-prayogaḥ sūcyate. AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 107.

205 *NŚ*, 4. 108.

206 *Ibid.*, 4. 109.

207 *Ibid.*, 4. 110.

208 *Ibid.*, 4. 111. The *ākṣipta* hands, which Bharata mentions, are explained as *vyāvṛtta* and *parivartita* movements and finally *khaṭakāmukha hasta* at chest. They are used in vigorous movement. *AB* on *NŚ*. 4. 111.

209 *NŚ*, 4. 112.

210 Abhinava explains that *kuñcita* indicates *ālapallava—dakṣiṇahastaśca kuñcitaḥ uttānālapallavarūpo vāmapārśve vidheyaḥ. AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 112.

211 Abhinava explains the *nata* or bent foot as the right knee bent on the ground in a half kneeling position—*adya nata iti jānugamanena bhūtalasañcāro lakṣyate. L.c.*

212 *NŚ*, 4. 113.

213 Śārṅgadeva says that the hands are *dolā hastas*—the body is bent inwards, the arms touch the ground and a wheel like spinning movement is performed.—*Yatra kṛtvāḍḍitām cārīṁ dolābhyām cakravadbhramet antarnatena gātreṇa tadūcūścakramaṇḍalam. SR*, Vol. IV, pp. 671-672. The wheel-like spinning suggests an acrobatic and not a dance movement. The sculptural representation of *Chidambaram*, too, suggests this.

214 Abhinava mentions the *aḍḍitā cārī* here—*aḍḍitā cātrādau cārī. AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 113.

215 *NŚ*. 4. 114.

216 From Abhinava's commentary we know that the *svastika* and *apasṛta* (i.e. moving away) movement of feet mentioned by Bharata indicates the *sthitāvartā cārī—Ityanayā (sthitāvartayā) cārya' pasaraṇam svastikasya kāryam. AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 114.

217 *NŚ*, 4. 115.

218 Abhinava says that the *ākṣipta* foot indicates the *ākṣiptā cārī* and the hand is *khaṭakāmukha*. It is used in the movement of the vidūṣaka—*ākṣiptayā pādacāryā pārśvasya kiñcinnamanena hastasya caturasrasya khaṭakāmukhsya kṣepaḥ iti. AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 115.

219 *NŚ*, 4.116.

220 *Patākau hastau parsparasaṁśliṣṭāviti AB* on *NŚ*, 4.116. used in context of *sūtradhāra. l.c*.

221 *NŚ*, 4.117. Abhinava explains thus—The right foot kept with the thigh made stiff is kept at a distance of two and half *tālas* from the left foot. Simultaneously the left arm kept stiff at the side is formed into the *ālapallava hasta* with the tip slightly spread out. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.117.

222 *NŚ*, 4.118. Abhinava—The *vidyudbhrāntā* and *daṇḍapādā cārīs* having been performed the hands moving around in the same direction by *udveṣṭita* and *apaveṣṭita* movements, are bent and thrown backwards sidewards. *Tena vidyudbhrāntādaṇḍapādābhyām cārībhyām udveṣṭitāpaveṣṭita recakavartanayā parśvayoḥ pṛṣṭhe'gre ca hastapādavikṣepaḥ. AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 118,

223 *NŚ*. 4 119.

224 *Cāṣagatyā cāryā prayogaḥ hastau ca kiñcidudveṣṭitāpaveṣṭitarūpau dolāveveti. Ā īṣat vartanam hastapādasya vatra tadidamāvṛttam karaṇam. AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 119.

225 *NŚ*. 4. 120.

226 Abhinava says that the *dolāpādā cārī* is preceded by the *ūrdhvajānu cārī—pūrvamūrdhvajānu tato dolāpādā AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 120.

227 *NŚ*. 4. 121.

228 *Ākṣiptayā cāryā vāmapādamākṣipya svadehakṣetrādapasārita-vṛttyā-*

vartya hastam ca vyāvartitaparivartitābhyāṁ tathaivākṣipya trikam bhrāmarikayā valayet. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 121.

229 *NŚ*, 4. 122. Abhinava explains the *karaṇa* thus—With one foot in the *sūci*, a *svastika* is made at the ankle with the other foot. With the *vyāvṛtta* and *parivartita* movement the waist should be twisted around and back on one side. Then the *baddhā cārī* is performed and hands perform the *recita* movement. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 122.

230 *NŚ*, 4. 123.

231 *Ibid*. 4. 124. Abhinava explains thus—The left foot is in *kuñcita* near the heel of the other foot. The chest is raised high. The hand at forehead is the *khaṭakāmukha*. Abhinava further says that according to some the foot here is the *vṛścika* type. This *karaṇa* is used in *tāṇḍava* for the appeasing of Maheśvara. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 124. According to Śārṅgadeva the *vṛścika karaṇa* does not pertain to the foot here but to the hand, i.e. (according to some) the hand should be as in the *vṛścika karaṇa—yadvā vṛścikahastaḥ syādabhineyo māheśvaraḥ*, *SR* Vol. IV pp. 682-93. *Tilaka cā karaḥ syaya "ityabhinayena bhagavataḥ paritoṣoḥ* *AB* on *NŚ*, 4 263.

232 *NŚ*. 4. 125.

233 *Ibid*., 4. 126.

234 *Ibid*., 4. 127.

235 *Ibid*., 4. 128.

236 Abhinava explains *añcita* as *karihasta*. *AB* on *NŚ*, p. 128.

237 *NŚ*, 4. 129.

238 Abhinava says that either the *atikrāntā* or *daṇḍapādā cārī* is indicated here (by Bharata)—*atikrāntayā cāryā daṇḍapādayā va caraṇamutkṣipyākṣiptam kṛtvā tathaivāgre nipātayet*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 129.

239 *NŚ*, 4. 130.

240 *Vṛścikavaccaraṇam*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 130.

241 *NŚ*, 4. 131.

242 Śārṅgadeva says that the hand at the chest is *khaṭakāmukha*—*SR*, Vol. IV, pp. 690-92. Abhinava mentions this hand pose, but does not specifically say that this was *vakṣasthaḥ* i.e. hand at the chest.

243 Abhinava himself considers that it is the *ālapallava* hand near the cheek, but opines that some others think that it is the *sūcīmukha nṛtta hastas—añcita ālapallava yo gaṇḍakṣetra.. anye tu sūcimukham nṛttahastam gaṇḍāñcitam punaḥ kriyāviṣṭamāhuḥ*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.131. This *karaṇa* was used in the adorning of the cheek and hence must have been used in *lāsya*.

244 *NŚ*, 4. 132. Abhinava expounds thus—The hands perform the *ūrdhva-maṇḍala* movement. One foot a *sūcīpādā*, with the *baddhā cārī* makes a *vivartana*. (the thighs are twisted). The *trika* is turned

by the *bhrāmarī cārī* — *Ūrdhvamaṇḍalinau hastavūrdhvadeśavivartanat. Sūcīlakṣaṇaśca.* (*NŚ*, 10.34). *Pādo baddhacārīmāśritya vicitrarūpatayā dvitīyapāde vartitaḥ anyonyajaṅghāsaṁvedhāditi tatopi bhramarikayā trikaṁ parivartitamāhuḥ. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.132.

245 *NŚ*, 4.133.

246 Abhinava mentions the *ardha-candra* hand — *Kaṭyāmardhacacandra iti pārśvajānu. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.133.

247 *NŚ*, 4.134.

248 Abhinava explains that the extended hands refer to *latāhasta* at the sides—*latāhastaṁ ca pārśvagau. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.134.

249 *NŚ*, 4.135.

250 Abhinava explains that *sannata hasta* means *dolā hastas*—*sannatau ca dolāhastau. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.135.

251 Abhinava also says that there is a slight jump with the *hariṇaplutā cārī* and *svastika* of feet formed thereafter—*(hariṇaplutayā) ityanayā cāryotplutyāgradeśe pādam svastikam kuryāt. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.135.

252 *NŚ*, 4.136.

253 Bharata does not specify the hand movements, nor does Abhinava. But Śārṅgadeva does. One hand is *khaṭakāmukha* at chest, the other *ālapadma* at head — *Khaṭakākhyaśca taddiko hasto vakṣasyathāparaḥ. SR* Vol., IV, 698.

254 *NŚ*, 4.137.

255 *sūci pāda* here does not denote the *sūcī* foot but *sūcī cārī*, *sūcīcāryā eva pādaḥ. AB* on *NŚ* 4.137.

256 *NŚ*, 4.138.

257 *Ekaḥ kaṭisthitaḥ pakṣavañcitako' ardhacandro vā dvitīyaḥ khaṭakāmukha eva vakṣasi. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.137.

258 *NŚ*, 4.139.

259 *Ibid.*, 4.140.

260 Abhinava mentions the *bhrāmarī cārī. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.140.

261 *NŚ*, 4.141.

262 *Samakālameva tatpārśvagam śiraḥ. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.141.

263 *NŚ* 4.142.

264 *Ibid.*, 4.143.

265 Bharata and Abhinava both do not specify the position of the hands. However, Śārṅgadeva does. He mentions the *dolā* and the *khaṭakāmukha hastas* — *Hariṇaplutayā cāryā dolākhaṭakāhastaṁ hariṇaplutākhyatam nāmoktaviniyogakam// SR*, Vol. IV, 702.

266 Compare this *karaṇa* with *sannata*, i.e *karaṇa* 75. Both are derived from the *hariṇaplutā cārī*, but the ultimate position in the latter is the *svastika* of the feet.

267 *NŚ*, 4.144.

268 Abhinava mentions the *bhrāmarī cārī* too – *Tameva kṛtvā dvitīye-notplutyā bhramarikāṁ kuryāt* *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.144.

269 *NŚ*, 4. 145.

270 The complete arm movement of *nitamba hastas* is described by Abhinava. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.145.

271 *NŚ*, 4.146.

272 *Ibid*, 4. 147.

273 Śārṅgadeva specifies that the hand at the chest is the *khaṭakāmukha*. *SR*, Vol. IV, 710.

274 *Prodveṣṭanakriyayā karaḥ karṇasthaḥ tripatākaḥ*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.148.

275 *NŚ* 4.148.

276 *NŚ*, 4.149, used in *raudrā gati...siṁhavikrīḍitam raudragativiṣayam*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.149.

277 *NŚ*, 4.150.

278 Abhinava explains that the foot moved back means the *vṛścika* foot. *Nikuñcita* hands means *Padmakośa* and *ūrṇānakha* This hand and foot movement is to be performed on both sides. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.150.

279 *NŚ*, 4.151.

280 *Ibid.*, 4 152.

281 *Kuñcitam padmutkṣipyetyākṣiptām cārīm vāmato vyāvṛtya karaparivartanena gātramānamya dakṣiṇamarālatāṁ nayet*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.152.

282 *NŚ* 4.153.

283 Abhinava explains the *karaṇa* thus—While performing the *dolāpadā cārī*, simultaneously the hands kept in *patākā* are clapped. Then the *vaiṣnava sthāna* having been assumed the right hand is placed on the hip and the *recita* movement is made by the left hand. This *karaṇa* is used for indicating sympathy. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.153.

284 *NŚ*, 4.154.

285 *Vakṣasi muṣṭihastaḥ pralambito latākhyaḥ janitā cārī*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.154.

286 *NŚ*. 4.155.

287 Abhinava explains in detail the hand movement. After executing the *janitā cārī*, the *arāla* and *ālapallava hastas* are placed on the forehead and chest (respectively). Thus with the *udveṣṭita* movement, they are brought to the sides and then again with the *apaveṣṭita* and *parivartita* movement to the chest with the hands facing each other. It is employed to indicate the secret meaning of sentences. Others consider *avahittha* as the gradual lowering of *śukatuṇḍa hastas*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.155.

288 *NŚ*, 4.156.

289 Śārṅgadeva mentions that the hands on chest are *khaṭakāmukha*.

SR, Vol. IV, 724.

290 *NŚ*, 4.157.

291 Bharata and Abhinava do not specify the hands, but Śārṅgadeva does. He says that the hands are the *dolā* and *khaṭakāmukha—Elakākrīḍitā cārī ceddolākhaṭakau karau| Sannataṁ valitaṁ gātramelakākrīḍitam tadā| adhamaprakṛti-prāṇigatigocaramiṣyate||* —*SR*, Vol. IV, 725-26.

292 Bharata simply mentions *talasañcara* feet, jump and dropping to the ground. This, as Abhinava says, indicates the *elakākrīḍitā cārī*, which is indicated by the name of the *karaṇa* itself—*Evaṁ nāmikarūpā cārī*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.157.

293 *NŚ*, 4.158.

294 *Anayā (ūrūdvṛttayā) cāryā saha vyāvartitakaraṇena nārālam khaṭakāṁ corodeśe pṛṣṭhe ca kṣipet*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.158. It is employed to indicate jealous anger born out of love, or request etc *L.c.*

295 *NŚ*, 4.159.

296 Abhinava explains the foot position as first bent or *nata*, then *svastika*, and then moving away. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.161.

297 *NŚ*, 4.160.

298 *Ibid.*, 4.161.

299 *L.c.*

300 *Apaviddhāyāṁ cāryāṁ satvāmūrustathā taccārīprayogakāle ca vyāvartitakaraṇenālappallavamūrupṛṣṭhe nyaset, sambhramparikramaviṣayametat*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4. 161.

301 *NŚ* 4.162. Abhinava gives the full details of this *karaṇa*. The right hand forms the *sūcīmukha nṛtta hastas* and the left moves away from it and is kept on the chest. The same i.e. left foot does *nikuṭṭana*. Then the process is repeated by the other side. Then the *sūcī cārī* and *ālapallava hastas*. Śārṅgadeva explains that this is performed by the right foot and right hand. *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.162; *SR*, IV, 737-39.

302 *NŚ*, 4.103. Abhinava says that this *karaṇa* was used to indicate rejoining. *L.c.*

303 *NŚ*, 4.164.

304 *AB* on *NŚ*, 4.164.

305 *NŚ*, 4.165. Abhinava explains thus—The *vaiṣṇava sthāna* is assumed in the beginning. Then one hand makes the *recita* movement, while the other forms the *añcita* or *ālapallava* at the chest. The head is rolled around and rests while rolling at the sides. *AB* on *NŚ*. 4.165.

306 *NŚ*, 4.166.

307 Abhinava explains that the head is alternately bent on each side.

It is called *nāgasarpita* because of its chequered movement. It is used to indicate light intoxication—*Parivāhitaṁ paryāyaśaḥ pārśvagatam śiraḥ . . . taruṇamadaviṣayam. AB* on *NŚ*, 4 166.

308 *NŚ*. 4.167. No clear picture of this *karaṇa* emerges from the description of Bharata. The explanation of Abhinava too, is not very helpful. The Chidambaram sculpture represents this *karaṇa* more as a gymnastic exercise, rather than a dance pose.

309 Abhinava mentions the *khaṭakāmukha* hands at chest—*Tatsahito'pi hasto dvitīya vakṣasi khaṭakaḥ. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.167.

310 *NŚ*, 4.169. The Chidambaram sculpture depicts this too as a gymnastic *karaṇa*. The description of Bharata suggests uplifted feet and Abhinava too mentions the *vṛścika* foot here. If both feet are lifted up, then the hands and head should rest on the ground, and this is perhaps suggested by Bharata when he mentions the *nata* hands and head—*Śirasaśca sannatatvāttena prathamaḥ padoddhāraḥ Sthitvā pādamūrdhvaṁ vidhāya tadupari. AB* on *NŚ*, 4.168.

311 *NŚ*, 8.9.

312 *Ibid.*, 8.12.

313 *Ibid.*, 8.13.

314 *Ibid.*, 8.40.

315 *Ibid.*, 8.41.

316 *Ibid.*, 8.42-44.

317 *Ibid.*, 8 119-20.

318 *Ibid.*, 8.120-23.

319 *Ibid.*, 8.130.

320 *Ibid.*, 8.131-32.

321 *Ibid.*, 8.137.

322 *Ibid.*, 8.138.

323 *Ibid.*, 8.142-43.

324 *Ibid.*, 8.143-44.

325 Śārṅgadeva mentions eight. Of these *grahaṇa* is mentioned instead of *lehana* and *niṣkarṣaṇa* is not an additional one mentioned by him. *SR*, Vol. IV, 496-97 (Adyar ed.).

326 *NŚ*, 8.148.

327 *Ibid.*, 8.149-50.

328 *Ibid.*, 8.154-55.

329 *Ibid.*, 8.155-56.

330 *Ibid.*, 8.163.

331 *Ibid.*, 8.163-65.

332 *Ibid.*, 8.171.

333 *Ibid.*, 8.172-76.

334 *Ibid.*, 8.17-18.

335 *Ibid.*, 8.19-36.
336 *Ibid.*. 9.224.
337 *Ibid.*, 9.225-34.
338 *Ibid.*, 9.236.
339 *Ibid.*, 9.237-40.
340 *Ibid.*. 9.246.
341 *Ibid.*. 9.247-49.
342 *Ibid.*, 9.252.
343 *Ibid.*, 9.253-57.
344 *Ibid.*, 9.259-62.
345 *Ibid.*, 9.263.
346 *Ibid.*, 9.264.
347 *Ibid.*, 9.266-80.
348 *Ibid.*, 9.214-19.
349 *Ibid.*, 9.18-27.
350 *Ibid.*, 9.28-38.
351 *Ibid.*, 9.39-42.
352 *Ibid.*, 9.43-45.
353 *Ibid.*, 9.46-52.
354 *Ibid.*, 9.53-4.
355 *Ibid.*, 9.55-6.
356 *Ibid*, 9.57-8.
357 *Ibid.*, 9.59-60.
358 *Ibid.*, 9.61-64.
359 *Ibid.*, 9.65-79.
360 *Ibid.*, 9.80-83.
361 *Ibid.*, 9.84-85.
362 *Ibid.*, 9.86-87.
363 *Ibid.*, 9.88-90.
364 *Ibid*, 9.91-92.
365 *Ibid.*, 9.93-100.
366 *Ibid.*, 9.101-05.
367 *Ibid.*, 9.106-09.
368 *Ibid.*, 9.110-16.
369 *Ibid.* 9.117-19.
370 *Ibid.*, 9.120-21.
371 *Ibid.*, 9.122-24.
372 *Ibid.*, 9.125-26.
373 Śārṅgadeva does not accept this definition as, he argues, it is not found in usage. *SR*, Vol. IV, 181-84 (Adyar ed.).
374 *NŚ*, 9.127-29.
375 *Ibid.*, 9.130-32.

376 *Ibid.*, 9.133-34.
377 *Ibid.*, 9.135-36.
378 *Ibid.*, 9.137-38.
379 *Ibid.*, 9.139-40.
380 Abhinava explains that *vipryāsta* means the *svastika* form—*Viparyastāviti svastikarūpau. AB* on *NŚ*, 9.139.
381 Abhinaya explains that *uttāna* means facing the self—*uttānāviti svasāmukhau. Ibid*
382 *NŚ*, 9.141-47.
383 This is the definition of *niṣadha* that has been accepted by Śārṅgadeva. *SR*, Vol. IV, 209-11.
384 *NŚ*, 9.148-49.
385 *Ibid.*, 9.150-51.
386 *Ibid.*, 9.152-53.
387 *Ibid.*, 9.124-25.
388 Abhinava explains *udvāhau* as the carrying of the bride and bridegroom to the marriage place—*Vadhūnāṁ varaṇam ca vivāhasthānānayane. AB* on *NŚ*, 9.155.
389 *NŚ*, 9.156-57.
390 *Ibid.*, 9.158-60.
391 *Ibid.*, 9.141 and 147.
392 *SR*, Vol. IV, 214-16.
393 *NŚ*, 9.185.
394 *Ibid.*, 9.186.
395 Abhinava explains this in detail thus—Two hands are first made to *caturasra* and then *haṁsapakṣa*. Of these, that which faces upwards is lowered and the other facing downwards reaches the chest—*Ādau caturasrau tat udveṣṭitavartanayā haṁsapakṣaḥ kṛta iti kṛtaśabdenāha vidhim Eko vivartata uttānaḥ sa tu, aparastvadhomukhaḥ sannāvartate vakṣasthānamityarthaḥ. AB* on *NŚ*, 9.186.
396 *NŚ*, 9.187.
397 *Ibid.*, 9.188.
398 *L.c.*
399 *NŚ*, 9 189.
400 Abhinava explains the process in detail thus—Two hands in *patākā* are made to cross in *svastika*, then they perform the *vyāvartana-parivartana* movement as *ālapallava hastas*. Then having formed the *uttāna padmakośa* they finally form themselves into an *arāla* and a *khaṭakāmukha hasta. AB* on *NŚ*, 9.189.
401 *NŚ*, 9.191.
402 *NŚ*, 9.192-93.
403 Here Abhinava explains *madhyasthāṅguṣṭhakau* of Bharata as the

thumb and the middle finger joined together—*madhyamāṅgulinivi-ṣṭāṅguṣṭhau kṛtau*. *AB* on *NŚ* 9.192.

404 *NŚ*, 9.194.

405 *Ibid*., 9.195.

406 *Ibid*., 9.196.

407 Abhinava explains in detail thus—Two *tripatākā* hands are placed over the cheeks, shoulder, forehead slightly cross-wise palms facing each other, the shoulders and elbows are slightly shaken and at the same time the palms which now face upwards *(uttāna)* move out. *AB* on *NŚ*. 9.196.

408 *NŚ*, 9.107.

409 *L.c.*

410 Abhinava says that two *patākā* hands first face upwards, then downwards proceeding from the shoulder region to the hips. *AB* on *NŚ*. 9.197.

411 *NŚ*, 9.198.

412 Abhinava explains thus—Two hands rise upwards from the sides, reach the head, and as in *nitamba*, emerge from the region of the hair separately and repeatedly, the one proceeding out as the other moves towards it. *AB* on *NŚ*, 9.198.

413 *NŚ*. 9.199.

414 Abhinava says that these are *patākā* hands, though he opines that according to some they are *tripatākā*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 9.199.

415 *NŚ*, 9.200.

416 *Ibid*., 9.201.

417 *Ibid*, 9.202.

418 *L.c.*

419 *Adhomukhau nitambakṣetre bhūtvā talenāviddhau ūrdhvagamanam*. *AB* on *NŚ*. 9.202.

420 *NŚ* 9.203.

421 Abhinava explains thus—One *haṁsapakṣa* hand approaches the chest and the other executes the *parivartana* movement and is extended out. *AB* on *NŚ*, 9.203.

422 *NŚ*, 9:204.

423 *Ibid.*

424 *Ibid*., 9.205.

425 Abhinava says that if '*urasaḥ*' of this verse is governed by the Ablative case then it would indicate a movement from the chest—i.e. from the chest to the sides. In fact, Abhinava describes a movement in which two hands move simultaneously from the chest to the sides in a circular motion. But, if, '*urasaḥ*' is taken to be governed by the genetive case, then '*urasaḥ sthāne*' would mean in the

region of the chest—*Athoromaṇḍalinau-udveṣṭita iti, cakārasaṁniyogena yaugapadyamāha urasa iti pañcamī tata ārabhya pārśvakṣetre bhramitavekasya gamanasya parasya gamanamiti vartanayā ṣaṣṭhītyanye vadantaḥ tatraivasthānamityāhuḥ*. *AB* on *NŚ*. 9.205.

426 *NŚ*, 9.206.

427 Abhinava explains thus—One hand is placed on the chest and then assuming the *ālapallava* form performs the *vyāvartita* movement. Simultaneously, the (other) hand is extended to the side. Then this other hand forming the *arāla*, executes the *udveṣṭita* movement and reaches the chest. Thus the movement of the hand at the chest or side is repeated by each. *AB* on *NŚ*, 9.206.

428 *NŚ*, 9.207.

429 Abhinava explains *kuñcita* as *arāla* here, and *añcita* as *ālapallava* —*Ekaḥ kuñcitorālavartanayā aparoñcitālapallavavartanayā punaraṅgaparyāya ityeva vartanānantaram khaṭakāmukhābhyāṁ svastika iti*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 9.207.

430 *L.c.*

431 *NŚ*, 9.208.

432 *Ibid*., 9.209.

433 Abhinava explains this in detail—Hands performing the *udveṣṭita* movement move from the chest to shoulders where they are extended and forming the *ālapallava* hands with slightly quivering fingers. *AB* on *NŚ*, 9.209.

434 *NŚ*, 9.210.

435 *L.c.*

Chapter 7

Development of Musical System : Gāndharva and Gāna

Abhinavagupta states that "out of *Sāman* arose *Gāndharva* and out of *Gāndharva* arose *Gāna*".[1] The word *gāndharva* sometimes stood for music in general, but also had the technical sense of a particular system of music. Thus says Abhinava : "It is to be noticed that just as the word *nāṭaka* so the word *gāndharva* is used in two senses, in popular usage as well as in the *Śāstra.* It is sometimes used in a general sometimes in a special sense...If mere singing was *gāndharva*, then the singing of children, cowherds, cranes, herons, etc. would also be termed *gāndharva.*"[2] The idea here is that, *gāndharva* sometimes connotes music in general, but it also has a special sense in which it is distinct from other types of music. It is in this special sense that the word *gāndharva* invariably occurs in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*.

What was the nature and purpose of *gāndharva* ? *Gāndharva* may be understood as the classical music of Bharata's time—elaborate, complex and governed by rigid rules—*Gāndharvamiti tajjñeyam svaratālapadātmakam*[3] i e. *gāndharva* consists of *svara*, *tāla* and *pada*. *Svara* is here related to the elements of both the *śārīrī vīṇā* (i.e. the human throat or vocal music) and the *dāravī vīṇā* (i.e. the wooden lute or harp).[4] This parallel between the human body and the wooden *vīṇā* is quite frequent in the *NŚ*. Thirteen constituent elements are related to *svara* viz, *svara*, *grāma*, *mūrchanā*, *tāna*, *sthāna*, *vṛtti*, *śuṣka*, *sādhāraṇa*, *varṇa*. *alaṁkāra*, *dhātu*. *śruti* and *jāti*.[5] All these pertained to the *dāravī vīṇā*, but only seven related to the *śārīrī* viz, *svara*, *grāma*, *alaṁkāra*, *varṇa*, *sthāna*, *jāti* and *sādhāraṇa*.[6]

The distinctive feature of *gāndharva* music was its elaborate patterns of *tāla* or time-measure. Even the basic unit for measuring time consisted of not less than five short *mātrās* (termed *kalā*). Twenty-one basic elements related to *tāla* viz *dhruvā*, *āvāpa*, *niṣkrāma*. *vikṣepa*, *praveśaṇa*, *śāmyā*, *tāla*, *sannipāta*, *parivarta*, *mātrā*, *vastu*, *prakaraṇa*, *aṅga*, *vidāri*, *pāṇi*, *yati*, *laya*, *giti*, *avayava*, *mārga* and *pādamārga*.[7] *Pada* or the words of the song had a subsidiary role in *gāndharva*. *Pada* served only as a prop for *svara* and *tāla*. Indeed the musician would often distort the words by stretching or splitting them and by singing only a particular syllable. *Svara* and *tāla* are primary (*svaratālānubhā-*

vakam),[8] *pada* is useful only in so far as it forms the base.[9] This tendency was perhaps inherited from *sāman* singing. The *sāman* singers did not attach much importance to the intelligibility of the hymns, but distorted the words freely. This was done in six ways viz. *vikāra, viśleṣaṇa, vikarṣaṇa, abhyāsa, virāma*, and *stobha*.[10] In present-day classical music, too, it is *svara* and *tāla* that are primary and dominate over *pada*. The words of the composition are necessary only so far as they help develop the *svarālāpa*, which is turn are fundamental for the unfoldment of the structure of the *rāga*. The exigencies of *svara* and *tāla* often cause the word to be quite distorted. Dattila adds a fourth factor to the definition of *gāndharva* viz. *avadhāna*.[11] Bharata has ignored *avadhāna*. Abhinava, apparently to justify Bharata, says, "*avadhāna* is *yogarūpam* (the nature of meditation) and hence is not applicable here."[12] The word *avadhāna*, it seems, stood for a meditative idea, a certain psychic concentration and attitude required for the proper singing of *gāndharva*.

Bharata states that *gāndharva* music was exceedingly dear to the gods *(atyarthamiṣṭam devānām)*.[13] The singing of *gāndharva* was, in fact, treated as a *yajña* or sacrifice by means of which the gods were appeased and by this transcendental merits accrued to the performer. Abhinava, giving a detailed interpretation of this verse, says : "Now, the gods govern the senses, the mind, sensations etc. These senses etc. function when impacted or vibrated and are like celestial musical instruments by offering the external objects such as sound etc. and through their transcendence (in pure apperception) one achieves a transcendent sacrifice *(atyarthamiṣṭam)*. It leads to the attainment of supreme inward beatific consciousness *(parasaṁvit)* * In this way is illustrated the attainment of the fruit of emancipation, since the experience thus attained approximates the blissful state proper to emancipation. Thus, this is a sacrifice of the gods *(devānām yajanam)* which is transcendent and independent of wealth etc. As has been said, Śiva is more pleased by *gāndharva*, then by ancient ascetic practices etc. (or, by the recitation of *purāṇas* and ascetic practices; or, by devotion to *purāṇas—purāṇayogādibhiḥ)*.

---

* Abhinava interprets '*atyarthamiṣṭam*' not as 'excessively desired' but as 'transcendentally sacrificed'. The offering in the sacrifice would consist of sense objects, such a musical sounds, spectacles etc. When something is offered through the fire it is sublated. Nevertheless, there is a transcendent effect, both for the gods as well as for the one who is performing the sacrifice Similarly here too, the offering of musical sounds etc is likened to a sacrifice producing transcendent effect. Cf Kālidāsa who terms dance as a 'visual sacrifice' in the *Mālavikāgnimitram*.

" 'Of *gāndharvas*' in the text indicates the performers. Thus, the singer obtains the result by attaining to a deep immersion in consciousness *(saṁvit)*. So it has been said that *nandayanti (jāti)* performed even once in accordance with prescriptions, purifies the slayer of a Brāhmaṇa. Thus, the result accruing to the performer is primary."[14]

As already mentioned, according to Abhinava, from *sāman* came *gāndharva*. The *gāndharva* form was apparently intermediate between later *sāman* forms and the *gāna* form of music (theatre singing) described in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Verse 10 of Chapter 28 describes the origin of *gāndharva* thus—*Asya yonirbhavedgānam vīṇā vaṁśastathaivaca, eteṣām caiva vakṣyāmi vidhim svarasamutthitam.*[15]

Abhinava comments saying that "song or *gāna* here is the name applied to the *gītis* or songs which are the matrix of *sāman* (i.e. it does not indicate *dhruvā gāna*.) *Vīṇā* means the *audumbarī vīṇā* used in *mahāvrata* (ceremony). *Vaṁśa* is in accordance with the tradition of teachers like Nārada. These constitute the source of *gāndharva*." Again "Some others say that the intention of the verse is to make out the source of *gāndharva* to be the songs sung by singers in the popular social stream *(lokapravāha)* within the *brahmagīta*. The commentator *(ṭikākṛta)* holds that *gāna* is primary while the lute and flute are secondary."[16] The mention of a popular tradition of songs within the *brahmagīta* is highly intriguing. Actually, it must be remembered that rites and festivals must have been concurrent in the remote past as they are now with the result that there would be a kind of culture counterpoint in the folk singing of the festival to the ritualistic and formal singing of the *sāman*. The mention by Abhinava of the *audumbarī* used in *mahāvrata* ceremony is significant and connotes folk influence.[17] In fact percussion music, too, it seems was the offspring of the popular percussion music of the Vedic times. Percussion music was then incorporated into the *gāndharva* form, wherein it was developed and elaborated into complex *tāla* structures. It may be noted that *sāman* chanting shows no evidence of *tāla*. Thus, though *sāman* music must have given the basic structure (the formal, rigid, ritualistic aspect) to *gāndharva*, folk music too, must have helped its development.

From *gāndharva* was born *gāna*. Generally speaking the word *gāna* means 'song', but the reference here is to a special type of singing—the singing of *dhruvās* (songs connected with the theatre), *dhruvā gāna*. This was the music played in the background during the staging of ancient dramas. Abhinava distinguishes carefully between the *gāndharva* form of music and the *gāna* system. In fact the entire commentary on the thirty-third chapter is devoted to distinguishing between

gāndharva and *gāna*. *Gāndharva* was essentially the musician's music, while the purpose of *gāna* was *rakti* or pleasure, the pleasure it gave to the audience watching the drama. Freed from traditional and ritualistic restrictions it developed into a great variety. *Gāna* included forms like *grāma-rāga*, *bhāṣā-vibhāṣā* etc. These derivative forms were born through mixing and combining elements taken from two or more *jātis* in various ways and were hence called hybrid or *saṅkara* forms. These forms when moulded to the theatrical context were called *gāna*. In *gāna*, much permutation and combination was permissible as regards both *svara* and *tāla*.

The *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata deals with only the *gāndharva* and *gāna* systems of music. However, the history of Indian music does not end here. Till about the 13th century when Śārṅgadeva wrote his *Saṅgītaratnākara*, Indian music grew through a continuous process of popularization and standardization. There was a continuous effort to retain ancient conventions but also to bring *lakṣaṇa* and *lakṣya* together. In the course of time, with the efflorescene of *gāna* and its musicological elaboration, a difference came to be perceived between the classical and the regional or folk dimensions of music. On the basis of texts like *Bṛhaddeśī* and *Saṅgītaratnākara* Dr. Lath has rightly pointed out that this distinction was termed *mārga* and *deśī* which may be roughly rendered as classical and popular.[18] '*Mārga*' according to Mātaṅga, is the name for *deśī* forms, albeit of those which were comparatively more regulated or rule-bound than the others. By Śārṅgadeva's time, the notions of *mārga* and *deśī* seem to have undergone development. For him, *mārga* and *deśī* signified two distinct forms of music and he distinguishes between them on the lines of *gāndharva* and *gāna* of the *NŚ*. Compared to *gāndharva*, the *gāna* system of music appeared relatively popular, but in the course of time, within the *gāna* system too, a distinction was made between the comparatively regulated and standardized singing on the one hand and free improvization on the other which led to the evolution of the *rāga-rāginī* system of later times.

Summing up, it can be stated that the history of Indian music reflects fully the dialectic common in the history of art of continuing conflict and resolution between convention and innovation, tradition and creation.

Footnotes

1 *Gāndharvam hi sāmabhyastasmādbhavam, gānam*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 9.

2 *AB* on *NŚ*, 33. 1.

3 *NŚ*, 28.8.

4 *Dvayādhiṣṭhānāḥ svarā vaiṇāḥ śarīrāśca prakīrtitāḥ*. *NŚ*, 28.12.
5 *Ibid.*, 28. 13-14.
6 *Ibid.*, 28. 15.
7 *Ibid.*, 28. 18-20.
8 *Ibid.*, 32.27.
9 *L.c.*
10 *Vikāra* : simple distortion of word.
Viśleṣaṇa : splitting of the syllables of the word and singing individual syllables.
Vikarṣaṇa : could change the quantity of *mātrās*.
Abhyāsa : a sudden break in the *pada* and repetition.
Virāma : pause.
Stobha : addition of new, but quite meaningless syllables.
11 *Padasthasvarasaṅghātastālena sumitastathā*
Prayuktaścāvadhānena gāndharvamabhidhīyate. —*Dattilam*, 3.
12 *AB* on *NŚ*, 28.11-12.
13 *NŚ*, 28.9.
14 *Yasmāt yadrupācca devānāmiśvarāṇāmindriyamanassaṁvedanaprabhṛtīnām, ātodyamānatvena vyavahāreṇa gacchatāneneti devavādyānām atyarthamarthātikrameṇa bāhya-śabdādiviṣayollaṅghanena...... miṣṭimicchāyajanam ca parasaṁvitsamgatilābhalaksaṇamupalakṣaṇam tathā tena prakāreṇa pratiterapavargacitānandasvabhāvaviśeṣeṇavarjitamityapavargaphalatvamdarśitam. Tathātikrātnam dhanādinirapekṣam cedam devānām yajanam yathā purāṇayogādibhyo'dhikā pritirgāndharvācchankarasyeti. 'Gāndharvanamiti' prayoktṛupalakṣaṇam, tena hyatyantam saṁvitpraveśalābhena tu gātuḥ phalayogo gāndhatvāt. Tadāhasakṛtprayuktāpi hi nandayanti yathāvidhi brāhmahaṇam punāti, iti prayoktṛgatamatra mukhyam phalam. AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 9-10.
15 *NŚ*, 28.10.
16 *Gānamiti sāmayanigītiṣu sāmākhyā, viṇeti mahāvratopayogini audumbariḥ, vaṁśa iti nāradādigurusaṁtānānuyāyiti gāndharvasya prabhavaḥ*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 28.9-10.
17 The *Mahāvrata* ceremony pertained to the preparation and offering of *soma*, and constituted a festive albeit holy occasion. Maidens bearing pitchers did a circular dance the foot-movement of which was in concordance with the rythm of songs known as *gāthās*. Such folk songs are mentioned by name—*Hillika, Himbinī, Hastāvārā, Samvatsaragāthā, Jhillukā* etc. in the *Śrauta-sūtras*. —*Lāṭyāyana-śrauta-sūtras*, 4.3., 17-23; *Kātyāyana-śrauta-sūtras*, 13.3.24ff.; *Taittirīya-saṁhitā*, 7.5,10.
18 See, Lath, M., *A Study of Dattilam*, pp. 165-70.

Chapter 8

Musical System : Elements and Structure

Sruti

Abhinava says, "*Śruti*, indeed means that (minimal) sound through which is produced a distinct audible impression."[1] He again reinforces the fact that the *śruti* is a distinct audible unit by saying that even though there is an atomic or infinitesimal *(paramāṇumātra)* change of location, there does occur a change in sound, which may be observed by the concentration appropriate to the *yogins*.[2] Thus, *śruti* was a cognisable musical microtone; however, it was not sung or played *per se*. A *śruti* was a musical interval; it functioned as a unit of measurement of *svara* or note, and a *svara* was supposed to consist of a specific number of *śrutis*. The octave was divided into twenty-two equal parts termed *śrutis*.

Abhinava says, "Some have objected that *śrutis* should have been mentioned first because the *svaras* are manifested in the order of the *śrutis*." He indicates the view of Bharata by saying, "The answer that is given to it is that this would be so if the *śrutis* called *dhvani* and *nāda* were to be themselves perceived as *svaras* at definite intervals. But this is not so because even high or low *śrutis* appear dependent on the *svaras*. As Bhaṭṭamātṛgupta has said, the whole detail of the *śrutis* arises along with the *svara* spontaneously. It assumes its nectar-like essence for the ear by depending on the *svara*."[3] Thus Bharata and following him Abhinava hold *svara* to be primary. The other school of thought, led by Dattila believed *śruti* to be the basis of *svara*. Certain specific *śrutis* out of the twenty-two attained the status of a *svara*,[4] thus making the *svaras* dependent upon the *śrutis*.

It may be noted that Bharata does not mention *śruti* in connection with the *śārīrī vīṇā*, but instead relates the *dāravī*. Abhinava. explaining this, says that "*śrutis* are useful only in the *vīṇā* (i.e. *dāravī*), because they are based on the tightening and loosening of the strings in tuning."[5] Again "The *śrutis* are clearly illustrated on the *vīṇā*."[6] "The *śrutis* are described only to divide the *grāma*,"[7] says Abhinava. The purpose of *śrutis* was to subdivide the octave into twenty-two micro-intervals and thus it could be of help in instrumental music. It is significant that the most fundamental aspect of *śruti* viz. the *pramāṇa śruti* or the standard *śruti* is described in the context of the tuning

process of the *vīṇā*. In fact, that is how it could be discerned, for it was not conceived in terms of any mathematical ratio. Bharata thus explains the *pramāṇa śruti*. *Pañcama* in the *ṣaḍja grāma* consists of four *śrutis*, in the *madhyama grāma*, it is lowered by one *śruti*. It is this difference of one *śruti* that Bharata terms as *pramāṇa śruti*. "The difference which occurs in *Pañcama* when it is raised or lowered by a *śruti* and when consequent slackness or tenseness (of strings) occurs, that indicates a standard *(pramāṇa) śruti*."[8] This is illustrated by the procedure of comparing two *vīṇās* first tuned to *ṣaḍjagrāma* and then differentiated so as to yield the requisite *śruti* differences. This has been given in detail.[9] Abhinava's exposition of the *pramāṇa śruti* runs like thus : " Now the question may be, what is this *śruti* ? The text (says), thus the lowering or raising by one *śruti* creates an interval by laxity or tightening. That measure is *śruti*." "Laxity *(mārdava)* means relaxation of the string. The opposite of that is tension. The raising *(utkarṣa)* of the *śruti* that is audible sound signifies higher pitch *(tīvratā)*, lowering *(apakarṣa)* means lower pitch *(mandatā)*. On this account relaxation and tension, (of strings) both have been mentioned as above. Thus, on account of relaxation and tension which are the causes of higher and lower pitch, there is an interval which is perceived distinctively and is the measure or determinant *(pramāṇa-niścāyaka)* of the *śruti* That is to say, that measure by which whether decreasing or increasing in terms of the accentuation or lowering of the pitch, a new sound, distinct from the earlier one is noticed, that is *śruti*."[10]

A host of questions rise in the context of *śruti*. Firstly, whether *śrutis* represent a purely abstract notion intended for theoretical analysis or whether they describe the actually used musical tones and intervals. Secondly, if *śrutis* stand for actual musical tones, are they still used ? Thirdly, if they are not descriptive of actual tones but represent some kind of abstraction, what exactly was their theory ? Fourthly, how far is that theory scientific ? Finally, what was the relationship between *śruti*, *svara* and *grāma* ?

While many modern interpreters like Strangways, Clements, Dainelou and Ācārya Bṛhaspati hold that *śrutis* are actual musical tones, some hold that they are merely ideal constructs.[11] The ancient position, as explained by Abhinava, seems to be that the tones actually produced are *svaras*, not *śrutis* but *śrutis* present a theoretical concept for understanding the relationship between the notes. The notes may be conceived as representing certain positions or intervals on an ideal scale consisting of *śrutis*. Since the notes have not been given any absolutely and objectively fixed positions, they will themselves oscillate

within a certain range even normally. In different melodic contexts, they will vary appropriately. Besides, they also varied by becoming lower or higher occasionally as required by *grāmas*, *jātis* and *rāgas*. Thus, noticing the variability of the exact pitch of the *svaras* and yet a kind of permanence in their relative order, it was natural to think of certain ideal positions and intervals which the notes could or could not assume. *Śrutis* represent these ideal positions and intervals. When the note, more or less coincides with some such position or interval, the *śruti* may also be held to be more or less manifested in the notes. Thus, the two positions, namely, the ideality and the actuality of the *śruti* cannot be rigidly separated.

There was an unavoidable search for pefection, which would have liked to clarify and objectify as much as possible perfect standards for the musicians to follow. The concept of *śrutis* developed in this search for an ideal measure of standard for actually used tones and intervals. The two could not obviously be identified. At the same time, they could not be wholly separated either. The situation arose because the nature of the musical tone was conceived mainly in terms of aesthetic quality. This necessarily meant a certain amount of vagueness and relativity, but it does not render the conception useless.

Many western and modern musicologists have tried to concieve musical tones wholly in accoustical terms and have sought to define them in terms of purely objective and mathematical relations. Three such perspectives are well known viz. (a) Just intonation, (b) Pythagorean intonation and (c) Harmonic intonation. Beside, there is the perspective of equal temperament. All these derived the series of musical notes in terms of fixed mathematical relations.

Clements describes the twenty-two *śrutis* as identical with actually used tones. *Śrutis* belong to harmonic intervals. Some of the harmonic intervals have been traced as *śrutis*. Like many other modern theorists, he correlates Bharata's 4, 3 and 2 *śruti* intervals with the major tone (9/8), minor tone (10/9) and semitone (16/15) of just intonation respectively.[12] Dainelou accepts 53 basic intervals in an octave. He regards the *śrutis* as minimal, audible and musically relevant intervals of which the basic are only 22.[13] The basis of fixing the *śrutis* is their relationship with the tonic, not the mutual changing relationship of the harmonics. Indian music is distinguished by constant reference to the tonic.

Mark Levy argues that the ancient theory of the *śrutis* cannot be connected with any consistent accoustical theory. He also argues that the present musical practice gives a picture of tones which cannot be fitted into the *śruti* theory. He has tried to measure the variation of

the musical notes and feels that their variations do not conform to the *śruti* intervals. Mark Levy opines that there is a widening gap between old theory and current musical practice.[14] The concept of *śruti* is controversial and in any case not found in modern music—the *śrutis* appear to have given place to twelve notes. Since empirical observations show that the notes used reveal no such standard relationships, hence, apparently, even if the *śruti* system were prevalent, it was no more than a confused theoretical idea and has long since been abandoned. What is found in practice is a considerable variation in intonation according to melodic context. Such a severe criticism of the *śruti* theory is uncalled for. Ancient *śruti* theory was not conceived explicity as mathematical theory. It is for mathematical theorists to build a suitable formula for *śrutis*. If the formula correctly applies it would not prove that the derivation of *śruti* implied the knowledge of such a formula. It would only prove that the *śrutis* were reached intuitively, though by nature musical notes follow mathematical relations. And hence, what was reached intuitively may yet be amenable to some complex mathematics. Hence Levy's criticism of interpreters like Strangways or Kolinsky is ill-conceived.

Again, the variability of notes sung today does not disprove the theory of *śrutis*. On the contrary, it strengthens it. Clement, Danielou and others are able to identify *śrutis* in contemporaray music. Levy's criticism does not allow enough flexibility to the *śruti* theory, nor does it take into account the fallibility of the measurement and the very limited character of the sample. Even the statistics is defective for its (1) neglect of mode, (2) neglect of randomisation of the sample, and (3) the extremely limited sample, which cannot be considered in any sense as representative of the universe.

Now, as aforesaid, the traditional Indian theory does not recognise such purely accoustical and mathematical principles as the primary source for deciding what was aesthetically admissible for the musician. Hence, the attempt to define *śruti* in terms of any one of these systems of intonations, or to build a consistent, mathematical accoustical system out of the *śrutis* whether as depicted in ancient texts or whether as supposedly practised today or yesterday must remain imperfect and hypothetical.

The ancient theorists did perceive some simple proportions and tried to express them in terms of three types of intervals—namely intervals of 2, 3, 4 *śrutis* as constituting the intervals of the standard notes. They also noticed that 9 and 13 *śrutis* were particularly pleasing. What is more, it was admitted that occasionally notes may vary from these positions by another *śruti*. An attempt was even made to

define the standard *śrutis* in terms of the audible differences between the *pañcamas* of the two *grāmas*. Other intervals were held to be perceived in the *catussaraṇa* of two similarly tuned *vīṇās*. Thus, the *śrutis* were held to be audible and practically useful, particularly in the case of instrumental music and more so when *vīṇās* of the harp type were used. Nevertheless, no strict mathematical measures were relied upon. The tuning itself depended on the tension of the strings rather than the control of their available length. Hence, it may be said that while the concept of *śruti* does not represent a mathematically precise system, it did represent a useful framework for analysis and description of actual musical practice.

Since *śrutis* had a practical use (both as ideal tangents for actual tones as also as points on an ideal scale in the description and standardisation of tones), their usefulness cannot be said to have ceased. Present day musicians are generally not fully acquainted with traditional musicology. They may not be able to use the intellectual tools of the latter, but that would be like the *bourgeois gentilhome* of Moliere, who spoke prose without knowing it. Thus Clements has argued that modern musicians do use ancient *śrutis* though they call them by such names as *atikomala*, *taratīvra* etc. The mere fact that the drone is used constantly, that string instruments have frets now, and that a system of twelve notes is common does not mean that the definition of these notes are to be in terms of the equal tempered scale or any other scale within the limits of toleration, nor does it mean that the notes do not occupy intermediate positions in actual melodic passages.

It is true that just as the decline of theoretical knowledge among the practitioners of northern music in medieval times has led to the obsolescence of the concept of *śruti* among many practitioners, similarly the growing vogue of western instruments with tempered scales and of western theories oriented in accordance with mathematical accoustics, have created a fluid situation in which musical sensibility is subjected to diverse pulls. Musical theory, consequently, is in a state of doubt. The situation is made worse by insufficient attention being paid to ancient texts and theories in musical education and research.

The ancient theory of *śrutis* has a clear outline, though its subtleties have been disputed. The *śruti* theory, as also its relationship with *svara* has already been discussed. The theory of 4, 3 and 2 *śrutis* of notes, *saṁvāditva* of 9 and 13 *śrutis* and of the relationship of *śrutis* with *grāma* will be taken up later.

The theory is aesthetic, not primarily accoustical. A scientific theory will give an infinity of tones and intervals, such as are produced

in the harmonic series. Which of these, in which order and combination will be picked up for a given musical sensibility is an essentially aesthetic question. It is not necessary that the aesthetic and cultural choice of a tradition should constitute a coherent scientific system of sounds.

From the preceding discussion it follows that we must avoid equating modern and western musicological terms with ancient Indian terms Thus, *śruti* cannot be identified either with microtones of any tempered scale, nor with the actual divisions of the harmonic scale. In fact, they cannot be simply conceived of any physical measure such as cents, savarts, nor as fixed harmonic ratio. This is because they have not been conceived in terms of any fixed physical measure either of length or vibrations. Like the *varṇas*, they are cognisable musical sounds. Their search arose in the context of noting the vibrations and relations among the notes, not in the search for physical causes and measures of musical sounds. The source of music was held not to be in the eternal sound called *anāhata*. Physical sound manifests the musical charm which belongs to the *anāhata* in the *suṣumnā* or inner *ākāśa*. When a material medium like air, or a string, or a column of air are struck, they vibrate producing sound. Under certain conditions, these sounds manifest musical charm and thus become transient images of *anāhata nāda*, giving to its universality and infinity, a specific individuality and character. Traditional Indian music is always attuned to this inner source, which cannot be fully defined in objective terms but can be clearly recognised. The concept of *śruti* was developed as that of an essentially subjective unit of measure for specifying the relations of notes—*śrūyate iti śruti*, the ear is the judge.

Similarly, the concept of *svara* is not exactly the same as that of the note or tone, because the number of vibrations of tones and notes vary—western notes are defined in terms of absolute pitches or fixed relations, but notes as sung by Indian musicians keep varying within a variable range according to the melodic context as interpreted by the particular singer. The Indian musician is not a mere performer, but a creator too.

Saṁvāda has been generally translated as consonance or harmony, but then again this translation is not a pleasing one, because *saṁvāda* was always conceived of in terms of melodic passages. For example, in the *ṣaḍja grāma*, *ma* and *ni* are not called *saṁvādins* by Bharata, although there is a difference of nine and thirteen *śrutis* (which is the number of *śrutis* between two notes to produce *saṁvāda* between them). It is explained by Abhinava in terms of the theory of *Sama Śrutikatā*. This means that the Indian musician looked upon the notes in a very

concrete manner. In determining *saṁvāda*, he not only considered the interval between the *saṁvādins*, but also to the immediate intervals leading to the notes. This is not a part of the western theory of consonance.

We can thus see similarities and parallelisms, but can hardly seek to identify the two systems. The western perspective is one of mathematical relations as the definition of musical notes and scales. It also tends to emphasize the harmonics. The Indian perspective, on the other hand, is of expressiveness, seeking to relate musical notes to inner states. The fact is that *lakṣaṇas* or technical terms in music are not purely scientific or physical, but rather conventional and pschophysical, embodying a whole tradition of taste, judgement and creativity and functioning as *standards*.

Svara

Svara is the first topic to be expounded by Bharata.[15] Bharata, unlike Dattila and Mataṅga, places *svara* before *śruti* as he believes *śrutis* to be secondary demarcations and subservient to *svara*.

Abhinavagupta gives the etymology of the word *svara*. Thus, he says, "the word *svara* is derived from the root *svṛ* meaning to sound or afflict, or from *svar* in the sense of *ākṣepa* i.e. blaming or attracting. Hence, it has been said that *svaras* are so called because they afflict the mental state constituted by the perception of sound *(śabdasvabhāva cittavṛtti)* by making it abandon its normal state of indifference, and at the same time on account of their excessive charm superimpose and affirm their own nature. Thus they are called *svaras*."[16] The idea is that in hearing, the mind is absorbed in sound and assumes its form. Normally, this state of sound perception does not affect the emotional state of the mind. Musical notes destroy this neutrality and draw the attention of the mind to their own specific beauty.

In *gāndharva*, *svaras* or notes are of three types—those which consist of four *śrutis*, those which have three *śrutis* and those which have two *śrutis*. No *svara* can ever have more than four *śrutis*, or less than two. Thus, Abhinava says, 'It may be objected that notes may have intervals of more than four *śrutis*. What is more, from *ṣaḍja* to *niṣāda* an interval of eighteen *śrutis* may be used. This is not so. When so many *śrutis* are in question, the element of musical sound *(nāda)* produced by the impact of air touching these locations is utilised. Hence there is the rule of the number of *śrutis* in the notes. Hence, if one hears a series of continuous or immediately contiguous pitches *(dhvanyaṁśa)* then the note is heard as deformed or discordant. Hence *ṛṣabha* consists of three *śrutis*. It is not the third *śruti*."[17] What Abhinavagupta is arguing, in effect, is that to reach one

note from another, the voice must jump fixed intervals of 4, 3, 2 *śrutis*, neither more nor less. Thus, if *ṛṣabha* has to be articulated after *ṣaḍja*, there can only be one jump of three *śrutis*, because there is no intervening note of two *śrutis*. These intervals thus become like musical quanta. Further Abhinava quotes Bhaṭṭatauta saying "So Bhaṭṭatauta has said 'the self experienceable *śruti* is *svara*'...... The *svara* is not (perceived or constituted) by parts. Nor is it a collection, since there is no simultaneity (in the parts). Even though there is succession on account of continuity caused by quick happening *(āśubhāvikṛtād)* there is a sense of simultaneity. The continuing mental impression produced by the successive *śrutis* up to the *śruti-sthāna* is the *svara* ensemble."[18] Though couched in somewhat obscure language Abhinava's meaning is plain enough. The *svara* is a partless and integral unity not a compound of simultaneous or successive parts. In the *śrutis* there is undoubtedly a succession of units. But on account of the quick process of transition their succession appears continuous and the last *śruti* where the *svara* is reached acquires its character from the continuous growing impression produced by the successive *śrutis* on the mind. In this sense, the *svara* may also be regarded as a whole or an *ensemble* which is reached through a successive and ordered process, but within which no parts can be distinguished. Thus while the passage from one note to another constitutes quantum leap in terms of musical interval, in another sense it is constituted by a continuous wavelike passage where only the last effect can be self consciously apprehended.

Abhinava qualifies the nature of *svara*. "Some say that the note or *svara* is that which gives a specific form to its basic *śruti* and has the property of being smooth or pleasing at a particular position of the *śrutis* within a given and fixed interval, produced by a light touch of breath."[19] Here, the *svara* is defined as arising from a transformation of a *śruti*. There is an interval consisting of a fixed number of *śrutis* within this interval. At a fixed point, the *śruti* is magnified through a light touch of breath, and the resultant note is smooth and pleasing.

But the essence of *svara* is not just its smoothness or sweetness, but the fact that it is characterised by resonance (in fact, this is what *śruti* lacked and hence could not be sung or played *per se*). Abhinava says, "We ourselves hold that *svara* is the smooth and sweet sound constituted by the resounding and produced by the sound arising from impact upon a *śruti-sthāna*."[20] The *śrutis* have fixed places. When some out of them are struck by an impact and a particular pleasing and continuous resonance is produced then we have *svara*. *Svara*,

thus, is of the nature of resonance *(anuraṇanātmaka)* which has continuity and sweetness and is produced from the magnification of specific *śrutis* at the end of particular intervals. Abhinava elsewhere says, "After impact is produced the sound, and after this, another sound is produced and this is characterised by resonance. This secondary sound (i.e. *svara*) has a naturally fluent and charming form."[21]

Then again, Abhinava raises the objection. "That since sound is produced by a different cause, the resonance should also belong to a different class. But this objection should not be made, because there is no such rule about causation. Thus, even though fire may be produced by a variety of causes such as iron, crystal, wood, lightening etc. even then, the smoke arising from it is of the same class............ One can distinguish the note of the *vīṇā* from that of the *mallaka* although the note may be *ṣaḍja*. That is why the impact *(abhighāta)* of non-singers does not produce resonance *(gātṛ* of the text should apparently be *agātṛ* and *ghātṛ* should be *ghāta)*. For that reason, although they equally produce sound, they are called imperfect. The intensity of the resonance corresponds to that of the sound produced by the impact and it is correspondingly sharp, harmonious or the opposite. The sounds produced by the impact on air on sixty *sthānas* produce (in turn) the sound consisting of the musical note of which the essence is *anusvāra* or resonance."[22]

Abhinavagupta is arguing that the true musical property belongs not to the sound consisting of any kind of mere physical vibration, but rather to a characteristic kind of resonance The physical sound seems to manifest the musical property of which the immediate locus or form is resonance. The physical sound is produced, while the musical property is manifested. The musical property has a necessary psychological aspect. It can be recognised by the mind as an ideal form even when the sounds manifesting it are different. In this sence, Abhinava's conception of *svara* may be expressed as *dhvani vyaṅgyadharmaviśeṣa* and readily reminds one of the grammatical notion of *sphoṭa*. In fact, Abhinava declares *svara* to be resonanse and compares it with *anusvāra*. Musical property, thus, becomes a supervenient ideal quality.

Vikrta Notes

According to Bharata, *svarasādhāraṇaṁ kākalyantarasvarau. Tatra dviśrutyutkṛṣṭo niṣādaḥ kākalīsaṁjño bhavati. Tadvadgandhārontarasvaro saṁjño bhavati*[23]—i.e. *Svarasādhāraṇa* is of *kākalī* and *antara svaras*. There the raising of *niṣāda* by two *śrutis* is known as *kākalī*. In the same way *gāndhāra* (i.e. when it is raised by two *śrutis*) is known as *antara svara*.

As aforesaid, the *gāndharva* system of music admitted of only seven

notes. Apart from these seven the only others that were permissible were *kākalī niṣāda* and *antara gāndhāra*. Both had the nature of being slightly sharpened notes,[24] being two *śrutis* higher than their regular intervals. As these were modified forms of the regular *gāndhāra* and *niṣāda*, they did not have the same status as the seven pure or *avikṛta* notes, and were subsidiary to the latter. Abhinava points out that the two terms *kākalī* and *antara* were only a matter of convention. As a matter of fact, either could be termed *kākalī* or *antara*.[25] These two notes were also collectively known as *svara sādhāraṇa*.[26]

Kākalī niṣāda and *antara gāndhāra* could not be employed as *aṁśa* in any *jāti*, since these were only modified notes—*vikṛtatvāccanaṁśaḥ*".[27] The *aṁśa* was the chief note in a *jāti*, whereas the *sādhāraṇa svaras* were to be used very sparingly.

The *sādhāraṇa* notes were thus to be used in some specific *jātis*, and there too in a limited fashion. Bharata states, "*Madhyama*, *Pañcama* and *Ṣaḍja-madhya*, these three should be known as the *jātis* in which *sādhāraṇa svaras* occur. The *aṁśas* in these *jātis* are *ṣaḍja*, *madhyama* and *pañcama;* as regards *pañcama*. its employment is to be made alternative to or in exchange of the extremely weak note."[28]

Abhinava explains in detail thus only when the three *jātis* had *sa*, *ma*, or *pa* as the ruling *aṁśa*[29] could the *kākalī* and *antara svaras* be used. In the seven *aṁśa jāti*, *Ṣaḍja-madhyama* where *ga* and *ni* were the *aṁśas*, the *sādhāraṇa* notes could not be employed. They were applicable only when *sa*, *ma* and *pa* were acting as the *aṁśas*. *Madhyama*, too, had five possible *aṁśas*, but again it was only on the occasion of *sa ma* and *pa* acting as *aṁśas* that the *antara svaras* could be used.[30] In the *pañcama jāti*. *sādhāraṇa* notes were employed only when *pa* was acting as *aṁśa* (this *jāti* had two *aṁśas* – *ri* and *pa*). This *jāti* was rendered *ṣāḍava* by the *lopa* of *ga* and *auḍuva* by ihe *lopa* of *ga* and *ni*.[31] Abhinava says that when *pañcama* acts as the *aṁśa* of the *jāti* and it is to be rendered *ṣāḍava*, then in place of the weak *gāndhāra* (it was not necessary that a note be totally omitted in *ṣāḍavita* or *auḍuvita*, but could be rendered as a weak note) an extremely weak *antara gāndhāra* could be used. Similarly, in the *auḍuva* form instead of a weak *ni*, the *kākalī niṣāda* could be employed.[32]

Grama

The concept of *grāma* is rather difficult for the modern mind to comprehend, for the notion is long since extinct. The *gāndharva* seven-note octave had a basic two-fold division on the basis of somewhat differing number of *śrutis* contained by certain notes. These two divisions were the *ṣaḍja* and *madhyama grāmas*[33]

In the *ṣaḍja grāma*, arrangement of *svaras* and *śrutis* was thus :[34]

Ṣaḍja	—	4 *śrutis*
Ṛṣabha	—	3 *śrutis*
Gāndhāra	—	2 *śrutis*
Madhyama	—	4 *śrutis*
Pañcama	—	4 *śrutis*
Dhaivata	—	3 *śrutis*
Niṣāda	—	2 *śrutis*

In *madhyama-grāma*, *pañcama* was lowered by one *śruti*[35] becoming *triśrutika*. Consequently, *dhaivata* gained one *śruti* becoming *catuśśrutika*. The *śrutis* of the rest of the notes were the same. The arrangement of the *madhyama grāma* thus becomes :

Ṣaḍja	—	4 *śrutis*
Ṛṣabha	—	3 *śrutis*
Gāndhāra	—	2 *śrutis*
Madhyama	—	4 *śrutis*
Pañcama	—	3 *śrutis*
Dhaivata	—	4 *śrutis*
Niṣāda	—	2 *śrutis*

In *gāndharva* system the *śruti* interval between notes can only be 2, 3 or 4. The *śruti* interval can neither be less than 2 or more than 4. Thus says Abhinava, "Beyond that with an interval of four or more *(śrutis)* on account of excessive effort, there is discordance in the notes *(vaisvarya)*. Hence there cannot be notes with five *śrutis*."[36]

Why two *grāmas* only ? Abhinava says that *Ṣaḍja* and *Madhyama* being *catuśśrutika* are 'full' notes *(pūrṇa)*, hence he gives one to understand that this is why the two *grāmas* are constructed on these two notes. He further questions as to why should not several *catuśśrutikas* then be predominant ? 'On account of fullness'. *Pañcama* (varies) as two notes, because of the ceasing of the *catuśśrutika* nature of *pañcama* (it cannot be treated as a *pūrṇa* note). The *catuśśrutika* nature of *kākalī* and *antara* is accidental, not essential. The permanence or indispensability is equal in the two cases (i.e. with *ṣaḍja* and *madhyama*). Hence there are only two *grāmas*."[37] What Abhinava means is that although *pañcama* is *catuśśrutika* in the *ṣaḍja-grāma*, it has a variant in the *madhyama-grāma* where it is not *catuśśrutika*. That is why *pañcama* is said to have two forms; hence, it is not a *pūrṇa* or perfect note in that sense. Similarly for *kākalī* and *antara* notes. *Ṣaḍja* and *madhyama* are invariably the only two notes which are full and permanent; hence the two *grāmas*, *ṣaḍja* and *madhyama*.

Abhinava states that the arrangements of the *śrutis* in the two *grāmas* could be clearly represented by diagram ...... "He remarks "now a bare note may be perceived or unperceived somewhere. But

they are relevant only as the part of a group. Such a group of notes is called a *grāma*."[38] What Abhinava is saying in effect is that just a single note sung somewhere in itself does not have meaning. A note acquires significance only in relation to other notes. It should be remembered that we do not have any fixed pitches for notes as in western music, nor were there any tuning forks in those days. Tuning was done, as now too, by the ear. This being the case, how could any scale be fixed, without relation to some tonic note or how could any instrument be tuned without beginning from some particular note and relating other notes to it ? It was not a tonic in the modern sense that it was the centre around which all the other notes revolved or that during the rendering of the melodic pattern one kept returning to it. It was the note in relation to which the other notes were established. This seems to be the role of the *ṣaḍja* in the *ṣaḍja grāma* and *madhyama* in the *madhyama grāma*. It has been pointed out that *ṣaḍja* was *lopya* in many *jātis* of the *ṣaḍja grāma*. But this does not negate the tonicness of the *ṣaḍja* here. It is the idea of *Ṣaḍjatva* that it important. Even now, in modern classical music we could try singing 6 notes without singing *ṣaḍja*. Even though not actually singing it, the idea of *ṣaḍjatva* is definitely there in our mind and the rendering of other notes is in relation to it (which otherwise would cease to have meaning).

Concepts of Vadi, Samvadi, Vivadi and Anuvadi

Vādi, *saṁvādi*, *vivādi* and *anuvādi*, were the four terms for four different kinds of notes to be found in the *jāti* singing of *gāndharva* music.[39] Bharata equates the *vādi* with the *aṁśa*, i.e. the predominant note in a *jāti—tatra yo yadaṁśaḥ sa tadavādi*.[40] Abhinava commenting on this, says, "Then he defines the *vādi*. *Vādi* is known in performance by its vivid shining out. It is also frequently articulated and indicates the determination of *tara* and *mandra*. Others say that *aṁśa* is a synonym .... Dattila etc. say that *aṁśa* is the *vādi*. It should be stated there that a separate definition of *aṁśa* is not necessary."[41] As stated by Abhinava, Dattila too regards *vādi* and *aṁśa* as synonymous,[42] Mataṅga[43] and Śārṅgadeva,[44] giving an analogy for the *vādi*, have called it the ruler among other notes. Nanyadeva terms it as the note which is prolific.[45] Siṁhabhupāla[46] and Kallinātha[47] also term *vādi* to be the most recurring note and synonymous with *aṁśa*. As Kallinātha explains, *vādi* was the main *aṁśa* of a *jāti*. The remaining *aṁśa* notes were the *paryāyāṁśas*.[48] He also says that any *aṁśa* note of a *jāti* could be made *vādi* and *graha* alternately.[49]

Bharata says that the notes which have an interval of nine or thirteen *śrutis* between them are mutually *saṁvādi* or that they have a natural harmony.[50] He enumerates the pairs of *saṁvādis* in both the

grāmas.[51] These are namely *ṣaḍja-pañcama*, *ṛṣabha-dhaivata gāndhāra-niṣāda* and *ṣaḍja-madhyama saṁvāda* in the *ṣaḍja grāma.* In the *madhyama-grāma.* the *ṣaḍja-pañcama saṁvāda* does not obtain, and is replaced by *ṛṣabha-pañcama saṁvāda.*[52] Now Bharata, Dattila[53] and others have spoken of nine-thirteen *śruti* interval *saṁvāda*, i.e. *dha* is located on the thirteenth *śruti* from *ri*, *ni* is on the thirteenth *śruti* from *ga*, and so on. But the actual interval existing between these notes is eight and twelve. Perhaps this is why Śārṅgadeva says, "*saṁvādi svaras* are those between which are eight or twelve *śrutis.*"[54] Abhinava, however, quoting his teacher, attempts to clarify this by saying that *antara* here does not mean interval, but form (i.e. of the *svara*). He says, "then he (Bharata) gives the definition of *saṁvādi.* Those which have an interval of nine and thirteen *śrutis.* This is naming the *svaras*. Others say eight or nine is called nine. Similarly, the interval of thirteen means where there are twelve *śrutis* in-between. They are called *saṁvādis.* But the *Upādhyāyas* say that *antara* does not mean interval (*antarāla*). It means nature. Hence the reference to the note of which the nature consists of nine *śrutis* Similarly, that of which the nature consists of thirteen *śrutis*, such notes are mutually *saṁvādis*".[55]

Abhinava states that there is no *saṁvāda* between *madhyama* and *niṣāda* even though the interval is of nine and thirteen *śrutis.*[56] He cites the example of *ṣaḍja-madhyama jāti*, where in its *ṣāḍava* form, even though *madhyama* is the *aṁśa*, there is *lopa* of *niṣāda*. Bharata does not raise the question at all. The answer is, however, given by Abhinava. He says—*samānaśrutīkatvena saṁvādānatsaṁvādinau*,[57] i. e. *saṁvāda* will accrue when two notes are formed with an equal number of *śrutis* (besides of course, the fact that there should be an interval of nine or thirteen *śrutis* between them). Now *madhyama* has four *śrutis* and *niṣāda* has three, so there will be no *saṁvāda.* Similarly in the *madhyama-grāma* where *dhaivata* becomes *catuśśrutīka*, there will be no *saṁvāda* with *ṛṣabha* which is *triśrutīka—madhyamagrāme ca na ṛṣabhadhaivatayoḥ.*[58] Abhinava here cites the example of *kaiśika-jāti* where in its *ṣāḍava* from the elemination of *ri*. where *dha* is an *aṁśa* is not an exception.

Thus, the two conditions for *saṁvāda* were, firstly, there should be an interval of nine or thirteen *śrutis* between two notes and, secondly, the two notes should be formed with an equal number of *śrutis.*

The meaning of *vivādi* in the context of present-day Indian music is that note which is omitted in a certain *rāga*, or that which brings about discordance. The concept of *vivādi* in *gāndharva* seems to have been different. As regards *vivādi*, Bharata says that "those which have

two *śruti* intervals are termed *vivādis*, such as *ṛṣabha* and *gāndhāra*, *dhaivata* and *niṣāda*."[59] Thus particular notes have not been singled out and described as *vivādis* to particular *jātis*. Instead two pairs of notes, *ṛṣabha* and *gāndhāra* and *dhaivata* and *niṣāda*, are described as *vivādis* to each other, *gāndhāra* being at a two-*śruti* interval from *ṛṣabha*, and so also *niṣāda* from *dhaivata*.

The concept of *anuvādi* seems to be that which is not *vādi* or *saṁvādi*, but also not *vivādi*.[60] Bharata ennumerates the *anuvādis* of the two *grāmas*.[61]

Ṣaḍja grāma :

Svara	:	*Anuvādi svaras*
sa	:	*ri, ga, dha, ni*
ri	:	*ma, pa, ni*
ga	:	*ma, pa, dha*
ma	:	*pa, dha, ni*

The *auuvādis* of *pañcama* and *dhaivata* are not clear.

Madhyama-grāma :

sa	:	*ri, ga*
ma	:	*sa, ri, ga, dha, ni*
dha	:	*sa, ri, ga*
ni	:	*sa, ri*

Murcchana

Ancient Indian music recognised two *grāmas*, on the basis of two different arrangements of *śruti* intervals according to the seven notes of an octave. Each of these *grāmas* could result in seven *mūrcchanās* which were the seven *svaras* of an octave in a serially ascending order;[62] each new *mūrcchanā* beginning on a new and successively lower note. These *mūrcchanās* were numbered serially and each had a distinct denomination. The first *mūrcchanā* of the *ṣaḍja-grāma* began with *sa* and ran thus—*sa ri ga ma pa dha ni*. This *mūrcchanā* was *Uttaramandrā*. The second was *ni sa ri ga ma pa dha* and was called *Rajanī*. The third, *Uttarāyatā*, was thus—*dha ni sa ri ga ma pa*. The fourth *Śuddha-ṣaḍja* ran thus—*pa dha ni sa ri ga ma*. The fifth was *ma pa dha ni sa ri ga*, and was named *Matsarīkṛtā*. The sixth, *Aśvakrāntā*, ran as following—*ga ma pa dha ni sa ri*. The seventh, *Abhirudgatā*, commenced with *ri* and ended in *sa* thus—*ri ga ma pa dha ni sa*.[63]

Similarly, the *mūrcchanās* were formed in the *madhyama grāma* too, each with its specified serial order and denomination. The first *mūrcchanā* in this *grāma* commenced with *madhyama* and was called *sauvīrī*, It ran thus—*ma pa dha ni sa ri ga*. The second, *Hariṇāśva*, began with *ga* and was thus—*ga ma pa dha ni sa ri*. The third, *Kālopanata*, ran thus—*ri ga ma pa dha ni sa*. The fourth, *Śuddha-madhyama*,

was as following—*sa ri ga ma pa dha ni*. The fifth called *Mārgī*, was thus—*ni sa ri ga ma pa dha*. The sixth was *dha ni sa ri ga ma pa* and named *Pauravī*. The seventh, named *Hṛṣyakā*, began with *pa* and concluded with *ma*. It ran thus—*pa dha ni sa ri ga ma*.[64]

Bharata remarks —*Evametāḥ prakramayutāḥ pūrṇāḥ ṣaḍavitauḍavitāḥ sādhāraṇakṛtāśceti caturvidhāḥ caturdaśa mūrcchanāḥ*.[65] This would mean that there were four classes of *mūrcchanās*—with full seven notes, with six notes, with five notes and with auxiliary notes. This seems to be contradicted by the fact that Bharata soon after says that *mūrcchanā* is an orderly sequence of seven notes.

Were the *mūrcchanās* then rigid heptatonic structures ? What in that case, would these four classes of *mūrcchanās* be ? Could *mūrcchanās* be rendered hexatonic and pentatonic too ?

Ācārya Bṛhaspati does classify the *mūrcchanās* into four types, but according to him, they are—*śuddha*, *antara-saṁhitā*, *kākalī-saṁhitā* and *antara-kākalī-saṁhitā*,[66] i.e. *mūrcchanās* with all pure or *avikṛta* notes, *mūrcchanās* with *antara gāndhāra*, those with *kākalī niṣāda* and those with *antara gāndhāra* and *kākalī niṣāda*. That is to say, he regards *mūrcchanās* as heptatonic structures, the only difference being that some are with all the seven pure notes, some have an *antara gāndhāra* instead of a *dviśrutika ga*, some *kākalī niṣāda* instead of *dviśrutika ni* and some with both the auxiliary notes, but in no case is any note dropped. Ācārya Bṛhaspati is of the opinion that *ṣāḍava* and *auḍuva mūrcchanās* are *tānas* and not different forms of *mūrcchanās*.[67] He quotes Śārṅgadeva who says—*Tānaḥ syuḥ mūrcchanāḥ ṣāḍavauḍuvikṛtaḥ*.[68]

The other view is that *mūrcchanās* were of four types—heptatonic, hexatonic pentatonic and with auxiliary notes. This view was held by Dattila, Mataṅga[69] and also Abhinava.[70] Abhinava, thus not only clearly, refers to *ṣāḍavita* and *auḍuvita* but even discusses them later.

A *mūrcchanā* can be accomplished in two ways. If in the *ṣaḍ jagrāma*, *gāndhāra* is raised by *śrutis* and considered as *dhaivata* of the *madhyama grāma*, the rest of the notes get automatically adjusted to *śruti* interval of the *madhyama grāma* and thus we can obtain *śuddhamūrcchanās* of the *madhyama grāma*. Similarly by the lowering of *dhaivata* by two *śrutis* in the *madhyama grāma* and considering it as *gāndhāra* of the *ṣaḍ ja grāma* the *śruti* interval will get adjusted so as to correspond with the notes of the *ṣaḍ ja grāma*.[71]

It is interesting to note that Mataṅga postulates *mūrcchanās* consisting of twelve notes.[72] The *raison détre* is that a seven note *mūrcchanā* is not sufficient for the proper unfoldment of *jāti*, *rāga* etc. as often the lower and higher octaves are not available.

To the basic seven note *mūrcchanā* five notes are added. The

twelve note *mūrcchanā* system of Mataṅga[73] etablishes the *mūrcchanās* of the *ṣaḍja* and *madhyama grāma*[74] thus :

Ṣaḍja grāma—

1. *Uttaramandrā : dha ni sa ri ga ma pa dha ni sa ri ga*
2. *Rajanī : ni sa ri ga ma pa dha ni sa ri ga ma*
3. *Uttarāyatā : sa ri ga ma pa dha ni sa ri ga ma pa*
4. *Śuddhaṣaḍjā : ri ga ma pa dha ni sa ri ga ma pa dha*
5. *Matsarīkṛtā : ga ma pa dha ni sa ri ga ma pa dha ni*
6. *Aśvākrāntā : ma pa dha ni sa ri ga ma pa dha ni sa*
7. *Abhirudgatā : pa dha ni sa ri ga ma pa dha ni sa ri*

Madhyama grāma—

1. *Sauvīrī : ni sa ri ga ma pa dha ni sa ri ga ma*
2. *Hariṇāśva : sa ri ga ma pa dha ni sa ri ga ma pa*
3. *Kālopanatā : ri ga ma pa dha ni sa ri ga ma pa dha*
4. *Śuddhamadhyā : ga ma pa dha ni sa ri ga ma pa dha ni*
5. *Mārgī : ma pa dha ni sa ri ga ma pa dha ni sa*
6. *Pauravī : pa dha ni sa ri ga ma pa dha ni sa ri*
7. *Hṛṣyakā : dha ni sa ri ga ma pa dha ni sa ri ga.*

It may be noted here that each new *mūrcchanā* is commencing from a successively higher note, rather than from one lower note each time (as is done in the seven note *mūrcchanās*).

Kumbhā[75] has given a severe criticism of Mataṅga's twelve note *mūrcchanā* system. It does not seem to have been accepted by later theorists, who consider only the basic seven note *mūrcchanā* system.

Mūrcchanās were the basis of the formation of *tānas*. Thus states Bharata—*tatra mūrcchanāśritastānaścaturāsitiḥ* [76] Abhinava, too, has a similar remark—*mūrcchanānāmāśritāḥ yātāstāsāmeva tevasthāviśeṣāḥ.*[77] Thus out of the *mūrcchanās* of the *ṣaḍja* and *madhyama grāma* were formed the eighty-four *tānas.*

As regards *mūrcchanās*, it seems, that they were not sung or played *per se*. It is significant that Bharata does not mention *mūrcchanā* and *tāna* in the list of topics of the *śārīrī vīṇā*, but only for the *dāravī.* As regards *tāna*, Abhinava says, "Although possible in the *śārīri* they should not be used there, because it is not conducive to ease, that it is inconvenient."[78] As they have not been included in the list of items in the *śārīrī vīṇā, mūrcchanās* as such were not sung at all. *Tānas* could be sung, but were usually not done so. They were, however, played on the *vīṇā*. Abhinava questions this :[79]

"Where is the use of the *mūrcchanās* and *tānas* ? It has been said that the form of the *tāna* is for the sake of the *mūrcchanās*. As for the statement that it is for the pleasing of the performers, the idea is that the listeners know the tradition. This is being said, although in this

tradition familiar to the listeners there is no use of the *mūrcchanās* .." That is to say, the *mūrcchanās* were not used directly i.e. not sung or played before the audience. This is again borne out by a very significant statement of Abhinava. He says, "*Mūrcchanās* are not like *jāti*, *graha* and *bhāṣā* useful in performance but *tānas* are useful in orchestra."[80] The difference between the two is quite clearly stated here, and allows no room for confusion. *Mūrcchanās* were not actually played or sung, hence unlike *tānas*, they had no role in the orchestra. Their role was merely to provide a functional basis serving to tune the instrument and providing musical scales.

In instrumental music their role was for tuning *(sāraṇā)*. Bharata states.—*Mūrcchanātāna prayojanamapi sthānaprāptyartham. Sthānam ca trividhaṁ pūrvoktalakṣaṇaṁ kākuvidhāviti.*[81]

The *mūrcchanā* helped the tuning of instruments to a proper scale. It is significant that Dattila refers to experts and their instrumental tuning *(sāraṇā)* in connection with the determination of *mūrcchanās*.[82] Bharata has not spoken of particular *mūrcchanās* for particular *jātis*, but Mataṅga has indicated particular *mūrcchanās* for particular *jātis*, and so Śārṅgadeva, too. A *jāti* can have many *aṁśa svaras*, so one should take such a *mūrcchanā* which would appropriately cover up the *mandra* and *tāra* limits given any *aṁśa svara*.[83]

Though Bharata does not mention *mūrcchanās* in connection with the *śārīrī vīṇā*, strangely enough, Abhinava does.[84] He tries to justify the role of *mūrcchanās* in singing by pointing out their use in the singing of *sāman*. So it has been shown 'he sings three songs by *uttaramandrā...*'[85] Again, earlier, he had stated "thus it is heard in the Vedic texts 'he should sing three *gāthās* by *uttaramandrā*' those wives will sing to you by *pātālikās*.[86] He also says that the *jāti Ārṣabhī* was sung in the *murcchanā* beginning with *pañcama*. Since it was a *ṣaḍjagrāma jāti*, it can be inferred that he meant the *Abhirudgatā mūrcchanā*.[86a] Thus, the concept of a *mūrcchanā* bears the strongest resemblance to a scale, seven in each *grāma*, each commencing from a different note. Indeed, in the ancient musical system, with its rigidly fixed scheme of determind *śruti* intervals between the notes, there could be no other method of obtaining a variety of scales.

Tana

Bharata declares *tānas* to be dependent on the *mūrcchanās* and gives their number as eighty-four—*tatra mūrcchanāśritastānaścaturāsiti* (*NŚ*, IV, Chap. 28, p. 27). Abhinava explains *tānas* as particular states of *mūrcchanās* ..*Tāsāmeva tevasthāviśesaḥ* (*AB* on *NŚ*, IV, Chap. 28, p. 27) Bharata states that there are forty-nine hexatonic *tānas* and thirty-five pentatonic ones,[87] thus eighty-four in all. By implication,

this would mean that *mūrcchanās* when rendered hexatonic or pentatonic were *tānas*.[88]

Bharata says that there were seven ways of rendering *tānas* hexatonic—by dropping 4 notes i.e. *sa, ri, pa* and *ni* in the *ṣaḍja grama* and by dropping three notes *sa, ri* and *ga* in the *madhyama grāma*. Thus the hexatonic *tānas* come out to be forty-six in both the *grāmas*.[89]

Hexatonic *tānas* in the *ṣaḍja grāma* : Dropping out the notes *sa, ri pa* and *ni* four *tānas* can be worked out from the *uttaramandrā mūrcchanā*. These run thus :

1) *-ri ga ma pa dha ni*
2) *sa-ga ma pa dha hi*
3) *sa ri ga ma -dha ni*
4) *sa ri ga ma pa dha-*
Rajanī 5) *ni- ri ga ma pa dha ni*
6) *ni sa - ga ma pr dha ni*
7) *ni sa ri ga ma- dha ni*
8) *ni sa ri ga ma pa dha-*
Uttarāyatā 9) *dha ni - ri ga ma pa*
10) *dha ni sa- ga ma pa*
11) *dha ni sa ri ga ma-*
12) *dha- sa ri ga ma pa*
Śuddhaṣaḍja 13) *pa dha ni - ri ga ma*
14) *pa dha ni sa- ga ma*
15) *-dha ni sa ri ga ma*
16) *pa -dha sa ri go ma*
Matsarīkṛtā 17) *ma pa dha ni - ri ga*
18) *ma pa dha ni sa - ga*
19) *ma- dha ni sa ri ga*
20) *ma pa dha- sa ri ga*
Aśvakrāntā 21) *ga ma pa dha ni - ri*
22) *ga ma pa dha ni sa -*
23) *ga ma- dha ni sa ri*
24) *ga ma pa dha- sa ri*
Abhirudgatā 25) *ri ga ma pa dha ni*
26) *- ga ma pa dha ni sa*
27) *ri ga ma- dha ni sa*
28) *ri ga ma pa dha- sa*

Madhyama grāma :

Three *tānas* from each *mūrcchanā* of the *madhyama grāma* can be worked out by omission of the notes *sa ri* and *ga*.

Sauvīrī 1) *ma pa dha ni - ri ga*
2) *ma pa dha ni - sa ga*

3) *ma pā dha ni sa ri -*
Hariṇāśva 4) *ga ma pa dha ni - ri*
5) *ga ma pa dha ni sa -*
6) *- ma pa dha ni sa ri*
Kālopanatā 7) *ri ga ma pa dha ni -*
8) *- ga ma pa dha ni sa*
9) *ri - ma pa dha ni sa*
Śuddhamadhyam 10) *- ri ga ma pa dha ni*
11) *sa - ga ma pa dha ni*
12) *sa - ri ma pa dha ni*
Mārgī 13) *ni - ri ga ma pa dha*
14) *ni sa - ga ma pa dha*
15) *ni sa ri - ma pa dha*
Pauravī 16) *dha ni - ri ga ma pa*
17) *dha ni sa - ga ma pa*
18) *dha ni sa ri ma pa*
Hṛṣyakā 19) *pa dha ni - ri ga ma*
20) *pa dha ni sa - ga ma*
21) *pa dha ni sa ri - ma*

Thus twenty-eight *tānas* in the *ṣaḍja grāma* and twenty-one in the *madhyama grāma* constitute a total of forty-nine hexatonic *tānas* in both the *grāmas*.

Pentatonic *tānas* could be rendered in five ways. There were three ways in the *ṣaḍja-grāma*—by omission of *ṣaḍja* and *pañcama*, by omission of *ṛṣabha* and *pañcama*, and by omission of *gāndhāra* and *niṣāda*. In *madhyama-grāma*, the two ways of rendering were by omission of *gāndhāra niṣāda* and by that of *ṛṣabha-dhaivata*. Thus, there were twenty-one pentatonic *tānas* in the *ṣaḍja-grāma* and fourteen in the *madhyama-grāma*.[90] It may be noted that the rule of *saṁvāditva* governed the omission of notes in pentatonic *tānas*.

By dropping the pairs of notes *ṣaḍja-pañcama*, *ṛṣabha-pañcama* and *gāndhāra niṣāda*—three *tānas* could be obtained from each *mūrcchanā* of the *ṣaḍja-grāma* :

Uttaramandrā 1) *- ri ga ma- dha ni*
2) *sa - ga ma- dha ni*
3) *sa ri - ma pa dha-*
Rajanī 4) *ni - ri ga ma- dha*
5) *ni sa - ga ma -dha*
6) *-sa ri - ma pa dha*
Uttarāyatā 7) *dha ni - ri ga ma*
8) *dha ni sa - ga ma -*
9) *dha - sa rī - ma pa*

Śuddhaṣaḍjā 10) *- dha ni - ri ga ma*
11) *- dha ni sa - ga ma*
12) *pa dha - sa ri - ma*
Matsarīkṛtā 13) *ma - dha ni - ri ga*
14) *ma - dha ni - sa ga*
15) *ma pa dha - sa ri -*
Aśvākrāntā 16) *ga ma - dha ni - ri*
17) *ga ma - dha ni sa -*
18) *- ma pa dha - sa ri*
Abhirudgatā 19) *ri ga ma - dha ni -*
20) *- ga ma - dha ni sa*
21) *ri - ma pa dha - sa*

Madhyama grāma:

By the omission of the two pairs of notes *ga-ni* and *ri-dha*, two *tānas* could be obtained from each *mūrcchanā* of the *madhyama grāma*.

Sauvirī 1) *ma pa dha - sa ri*
2) *ma pa - ni sa - ga*
Hariṇāśva 3) *- ma pa dha - sa ri*
4) *ga ma pa - ni sa -*
Kalopanatā 5) *ri - ma pa dha - sa*
6) *- ga ma pa - ni sa*
Śuddhamadhyamā 7) *sa ri - ma pa dha ni*
8) *dha ni sa - ga ma -*
Mārgī 9) *- sa ri - ma pa dha*
10) *ni sa - ga ma pa -*
Pauravī 11) *dha - sa ri ma pa*
12) *- ni sa - ga ma pa*
Hṛṣyakā 13) *pa dha - sa ri - ma*
14) *pa - ni sa - ga ma*

Bharata in his list of topics relating to *svara* mentions only seven items as relating to the *śārīrī vīṇā* or vocal music. *Tāna* has not been included in it. Abhinava explains this by saying, "*Tāna*, although possible in the *śārīrī* should not be used there because it is not conducive to ease; it is inconvenient. It is used for the sake of practice, but success in it arises only through the exact number of notes in the *vīṇā* (i.e. even while *tāna* is being used in vocal practice, even then one has to take help of the *vīṇā* which is capable of producing the exact number of notes required. Thus even then one has to take the help of the *vīṇā* which is capable of producing the exact number of notes required). Thus even when one is not able to produce the notes from the voice, one may, by having the distinction of notes comprehended by the heart, be able to produce the notes on the *vīṇā*."[91] It seems, thus,

that though *tāna* was possible in the *śārīrī* it was actually more popular in the *vīṇā*. It may be noted that the word *tāna* derives from the root *tan* which means to 'stretch' or 'pull'; perhaps this reference to the stretching or pulling of string or strings indicates instrumental playing as the source of *tānas*.

Bharata describes *tānakriyā*, or the method of playing *tānas* on the *vīṇā*, when certain notes are to be dropped. *Tānakriyā*, says Bharata, can be executed in two ways, by *praveśa* and *nigraha*. Bharata explains *Nigraha* as non-touching. *Praveśa* is the sharpening of the preceding note or the softening of the succeeding note.[92] *Nigraha* is clear enough. It means that when a note is to be dropped, it is simply avoided. Explaining *praveśa* Abhinava says that when a note, say *ṣaḍ ja*, was to be dropped, then (by the tightening of the string) the note could be raised and rendered as *ṛṣabha*. Alternately in the *uttaramandrā mūrcchanā* (the *ṣaḍjagrāmikī mūrcchanā* which began with *ṣaḍja*) when *sa* was to be dropped (the string could be) lowered and tuned to *ni*. Whether the note was to be rendered higher or lower depended on whichever note happened to be stronger in that particular *jāti*, and thus further strength was imparted to the already strong note.[93]

The basic idea was that in *praveśa*, the omissible note was not avoided while playing, but assimilated into its neighbouring note, whether higher or lower, as required by the exigencies of the melodic structure.

Sthana

Bharata, in the 17th chapter mentions three *sthānas* viz. chest, throat and head.[94] He co-relates these three *sthānas* with the three octaves—*mandra*, *madhya* and *tāra*, while giving the details of the nature and variety of *kāku*.[95] Bharata, here uses the analogy of the *vīṇā* in the context of *sthāna* for human frame in saying that *kāku* arises from the three *sthānas* of the '*śārīrī vīṇā*', chest, throat and head.

Octaves lower or higher than *mandra* or *tāra* might have been used specially in the *dāravī vīṇā*, though there is no such specific reference. Bharata does not mention terms such as *tāratara*, *anumandra* and *mandratara*.[96] However, Abhinava explains that these are not octaves beyond the normal three but relatively higher or lower positions within *mandra* and *tāra*.[97]

The *madhya saptaka* or the middle octave was the most important one, whether in vocal or in instrumental music, the middle octave was taken in its entirety;[98] but there were restrictions as regards the movement of notes in the *mandra* and *tāra* in specific *jātis*.

Jatis

Eighteen *jātis* or musical modes have been described by Bharata —*samavāyajjātayastu jāyante*[99] i.e. *jātis* are born of a conglomeration. The conglomeration was the grouping together of the various *jāti-lakṣaṇas* or characteristics of a *jāti*, which then gave rise to a particular melodic structure termed *jāti*. *Daśakaṁ jātilakṣaṇam*—thus Bharata enumerates ten characteristic features of a *jāti*. These were the (1) *graha* (2) *aniśa* (3) *tara* (4) *mandra* (5) *nyāsa* (6) *apanyāsa* (7) *alpatva* (8) *bahutva* (9) *ṣāḍava* (10) *auḍuvita*.[100] On *graha* Bharata says—*grahastu sarva jātināmaṁśavatparikīrtitaḥ yatpravṛttaṁ bhaved-geyamaṁśo grahavikalpitaḥ*[101]

Graha was the note used at the commencing of a melody. Thus says Dattila '*grahastu gītādisvaraḥ*'[102] and Mataṅga thus—*jātyādiprayogān grāhyate yenāsau grahaḥ*.[103] That the *graha* was the initial note of a melody is an accepted fact. The controversial aspect, however, is its relationship with the *aṁśa*. Is *graha* only similar to *aṁśa* or is it in fact identical with it ? The second line has been translated by M. M. Ghosh thus—"The note which is taken up in the beginning (of a song) is the *graha* and is an alternative term for the *aṁśa*."[104] This could also be translated as the note which is taken up in the beginning (of a song) is a *graha*, or as an alternative the *aṁśa* (can be used). Abhinava, commenting on this verse, gives some clues to the relationship between *graha* and *aṁśa*—*Prāyo aṁśasyaiva grahatvamutsṛṣṭam*.[105] Then again, "what is this *graha* ? The text answers—it is another name for that (for *aṁśa* ?) How ? The answer is 'that by which the song is to begin. Hence it is another name for *aṁśa*.' He (Bharata) says 'constructed by *graha*'— (this means) when conjoined with another property, by the property of *graha* thus constructed it is made as of two natures. It becomes *graha* not simply by predominance...... Sometimes *aṁśa* does not become *graha*, for example *pañcama* (is *aṁśa*) in *Nandayantī*, *gāndhāra* is its *graha*. Hence, *graha* must be mentioned separately. Even though there are not many illustrations, yet the principle (is enunciated). In the *grāma rāga* etc.. it is not possible to recognise the *grahatva* of a note other than the *aṁśa*."[106] From the above reading it becomes clear that though almost invariably *aṁśa* and *graha* were the same. but there were some exceptions, as in *Nandayantī jāti*; hence each had their independent status too. *Graha*, being the initial melodic note, had a limited role, whereas *aṁśa* was a much larger concept. It was the note which determined the form of a melodic structure and was the dominant note in it.[107] The *grahas* specified for a *jāti* are exactly the same as their *aṁśas*, except for *Nandayantī*.

Bharata enumerates ten characterstics of the *aṁśa* : (1) It is the note from which is generated the charm of the *rāga* and on which it depends; (2) it determines the range of the *mandra*, and (3) the range of *tara* and *mandra*; (4) it is the most dominant note. Also it determines the (5) *graha*, (6) *apanyāsa*, (7) *vinyāsa*, (8) *sannyāsa*, and (9) *nyāsa*, and (10) is the note which others follow.[108]

Range in the upper octave or *tāragati* : In contrast to present-day classical music, where the singer has the freedom to move in all three octaves, in *gāndharva* music there were strict rules regarding the use of notes in the lower and upper octaves and thus regulated, the movement in the *mandra* and *tāra* was a limited one. In the *tāra* or upper octave one could only sing up to the fourth *aṁśa* and not beyond that.[110] Abhinava explains this thus—"with the *aṁśa svara*, four or five notes of the *tāra saptaka* are to be used. For example when *ṣaḍja* is *aṁśa*, *sa*, *ri*, *ga* *ma*, *pa* with *ṛṣabha ri*, *ga*, *ma*, *pa*, *dha;* with *gāndhāra ga*, *ma*, *pa*, *dha*, *ni;* with *madhyama ga*, *ma*, *pa*, *dha*, *ni;* and similarly with *pañcama*, *dhaivata* and *niṣāda*. It is these that are established by practice (*lakṣya*)."[111] Further, Abhinava says that if one could not sing very high, there was no harm in singing a note lower than the prescribed one in the upper octave, but one ought never to sing a note higher than the prescribed one. Thus he says, "If *ṣaḍja* is the *aṁśa*, then the *tāra saptaka* should be taken upto *ri*, *ga*, *ma (pa)*, if one has the capability of doing so (i.e. if one can stretch the voice so high), but even if one is capable, one should not go beyond that. But taking a lower note is not faulty. This is shown by the word *para*. When *ṛṣabha* is the *aṁśa*, the notes are to be taken upto *dhaivata* (from) the *ṛṣabha* of the *tāra saptaka*. When *gāndhāra* is the *āṁśa*, the notes are to be taken up to *dhaivata* (from) the *ṛṣabha* of the *tāra saptaka*. When *gāndhāra* is the *aṁśa*, then the seven notes ending with *niṣāda* (may be used); *madhyama*, *pañcama* and *dhaivata* those (being the *aṁśa*) the notes upto *niṣāda* are to be taken. In these five *aṁśas*, the whole of the *tāra saptaka* is to be taken. If the capability is medium, then the *āroha* is only up to four notes But in the *Nandayantī* the extreme limit in *tāra* is explained there (thus) that the movement in the *tāra saptaka* never goes beyond the *ṣaḍja*."[112] Thus as stated, in the *Nandayantī* the rule of the fourth-fifth note did not apply; movement in the *tāra saptaka* was totally prohibited there. Bharata specifically says this about the *Nandayantī—tāragatyatu ṣaḍjastu (saḍjopi) kadācinnātivartate......*[113]

Movement in the lower octave or *mandragati* is three-fold[114] viz. (1) one could descend up to the *aṁśa*; (2) another lower limit was the *nyāsa*; and (3) a third possible lower limit was the note immediately

below the *nyāsa*.[115]

Nyāsa : *Aṅgasamaptau nyāsaḥ* [116] states Bharata; i.e. *nyāsa* occurs at the end of an *aṅga* or part i.e. at the end of a portion of the melodic structure. Abhinava, however, explains *nyāsa* to be the concluding note of the *jāti* itself. i.e. the note on which the *jāti* ends.[117] *Apanyāsa*[118] occurred at the end of smaller parts within the melodic structure. Every *jāti* had specific notes prescribed as *nyāsa* or *apanyāsa* for them.

Alpatva : When a note was sparingly used in a *jāti*, this was termed as *alpatva*. This was effected in two ways : (1) by *laṅghana*, and (2) by *anābhyāsa*.[119] Abhinava explains *laṅghana* thus : "*Laṅghana* means proceeding to another note while touching, not resting." Thus *laṅghana* was the gliding over of a note or touching it slightly in such a way that being unemphasized itself, it tended to highlight the note following it.[120]

Abhinava, explaining the use of *laṅghana*, says, "where in the *pūrṇāvasthā*. a *lopya-svara* is employed, there that note is frequently glided over (*laṅghana*).[121] *Anābhyāsa* was to avoid repeating of the note. It operated on weak notes, i.e. was used when *anāṁśas* (neither *aṁśa* nor *paryāyāṁśa*) were used. Thus says Abhinava, "Occasionally there is also non-repetition or *anābhyāsa*. There is *anābhyāsa* when those notes are used in the *antarāmārga* which are not *paryāyāṁśas* such as *niṣāda* and *ṛṣabha* in the *ṣāḍji*."[122] Thus often in *ṣāḍavita* or *auḍuvita*, i.e. the hexatonic or pentatonic *jātis*, notes were often not omitted totally, but rendered weak, i.e. *alpatva* was effected.[123]

Bahutva : Bharata defines *bahutva* as the note which was strong.[124] Abhinava, too, states, "Now he mentions *bahutva* and defines it by saying that *alpa* is that which is weak (*abala*) and in contrast the strong note in frequent (*bahutva*) as may be understood by implication."[125] Thus, *bahutva* was the note which was dominant and prolifically used in a *jāti*. Though Bharata does not say so specifically, however, Abhinava postulates *bahutva* also to be two fold. ".... like the *alpatva* belonging to the *jāti*, *bahutva* is also two-fold......" Thus *bahutva* is two-fold due to *alaṅghana* (non-skipping) and *abhyāsa* (repetition) [126] "The notes which were obviously prolific in a *jāti* were the *vādi* and *saṁvādi*. Other notes where the *bahutva* was effected were the *paryāyāṁśas* or alternate *aṁśas*.[127]

Hexatonic treatment of *jātis* is indicated with *ṣāḍavita* and there are 14 hexatonic *jātis*. Pentatonic treatment of *jātis* was termed *auḍuvita* there being 10 such *jātis*.[128]

Other important elements in the structure of a *jāti* were *sannyāsa*, *vinyāsa* and *antarāmārga*. Bharata, Dattila and others have spoken of only 10 elements characterising a *jāti* and have treated these three

separately. Śārṅgadeva however, speaks of 13 charactertics of a *jāti*[129] as he has included these 3 characteristics too, and not described them separately. *Sannyāsa* was the concluding note of the first *vidārī* (a sub-division of the melodic structure).[130] Both Dattila and Śārṅgadeva state that it was not a *vivādī* of the *aṁśa*.[131] *Vinyāsa* is defined by Bharata as the note which occurs at the end of a *pada* or word.[132] Abhibava and Sārṅgadeva complete this definition by saying that, that was the concluding note of a *pada* within a *vidārī* unit.[133]

Antaramārga was the typical movement of *svaras* in a *jāti* which helped in the unfoldment of the character of the *jāti*.[134] It may be compared to the present-day term '*calan*' which is particular movement in a *rāga* which gives it its individuality.

Eighteen *jātis* have been enumerated by Bharata, 7 belonging to the *ṣaḍja-grāma* and the rest to the *madhyama-grāma*. The *ṣaḍ ja-grāmikī jātis* are *Ṣaḍjī*, *Ārṣabhī*. *Dhaivatī*, *Naiṣādī*, *Ṣaḍjodīcyavatī* *Ṣaḍja-kaiśikī* and *Ṣaḍja-madhyama* The *madhyama-grāmikī jātis* are thus—*Gāndhārī*, *Madhyamā*, *Gandharodīcyavā*. *Pañcamī*. *Rakta-gāndhārī*, *Gāndhārapañcamī*, *Madhyamodicyavā* *Nandayantī*, *Karmāravī*, *Āndhrī* and *Kaiśikī*.[135] Bharata mentions a third category of *jātis* in which the *sādharaṇa* notes were used. The *sādhāraṇa* notes had a limited role in *gāndhāra* and there were strict rules regulating the use of *sādhāraṇa* in *gandharva* music. Bharata states that the *sādhāraṇa* could be used only in the singing of 3 *jātis*; viz. *madhyamā*, *ṣaḍja-madhyamā* and *Pañcamī*.[136]

The 18 *jātis* were further subdivided into two—*śuddha* and *vikṛta*. *Śuddha jātis* were those which were named after the seven *svaras* and that very note after which the *jāti* was named was its *aṁśa*, *graha*, *nyāsa* and *apanyāsa*. There were 7 *śuddha jātis* which were thus—*Ṣāḍjī*, *Ārṣabhī*. *Dhaivatī* and *Niṣāḍinī* in the *ṣaḍjā grāma* and *Gāndhārī*, *Mādhyamā* and *Pañcamī* in the *madhyama-grāma*.[137] It also had the *nyāsa svara* regularly in the *mandra* and did not have notes dropped from it. When two or more characteristics of the *śuddha-jāti* were altered except for the *nyāsa* it was termed a *vikṛta jāti*.[138] There were born through mutal combination *(saṁsarga)* of the *śuddha-jātis*.[139] These were 11 in number and their names and origin have been enumerated by Bharata.[140]

Parent *jātis* *(Śuddha)*	Derived *jātis* *Saṁsargaja Vikṛta*
1. Ṣāḍjī and Madhyamā	Ṣāḍjamadhyamā
2. Gāndhārī, Ṣāḍjī	Ṣāḍjakaiśikī
3. Ṣāḍjī Gāndhārī	Ṣāḍjodicyavā

Dhaivatī	
4. Ṣāḍjī Gāndhārī Madhyamā Dhaivatī	Gāndhārodi- cyavatī
5. Gāndhārī Pañcamī Madhyamā Dhaivatī	Madhyamodicyavatī
6. Gāndhārī Pañcamī Saptamī (Naiṣāḍī)	Raktagāndhārī
7. Gāndhārī Ārṣabhī	Āndhrī
8. Ārṣabhī Pañcamī Gāndhārī	Nandayantī
9. Ārṣabhī Pañcamī	Karmāravī
10. Gāndhārī Pañcamī	Gandharapañcamī
11. Ṣāḍjī Gāndhārī Madhyamā Pañcamī Naiṣādī	Kaiśikī

Since these had some characteristics of the *Śuddha* altered in them, they were termed *vikṛtā*; since they were born of combination, they were also *saṁsaragajā*.[141]

Bharata speaks of 4 *jātis* which always had 7 notes. 4 were hexatonic and 10 were pentatonic. *Madhyamodicyavā, Ṣaḍjakaiśikī Karmāravī* and *Gāndhārapañcamī* had all the 7 notes. *Ṣḍājī Āndharī Nandayantī* and *Gāndharodicyavā* were hexatonic. The pentatonic *jātis Naiṣādī. Ārṣabhī, Dhaivatī, Ṣaḍjamadhyamā* and *Ṣaḍjodicyavatī* of the *Ṣaḍjagrāma;* the *madhyamagrāmikī* pentatonic *jātis* were *Gāndhārī Raktagāndhārī, Madhyamā. Pañcamī* and *Kaiśikī*. However, Bharata also adds that those that were hexatonic could sometimes be rendered as pentatonic and vice-versa Another general rule that governed these *jātis* was that in the rendering of *Ṣaḍvita* and *auḍuvita* of these *jātis* the *saṁvādi* could not be dropped. Hence the *jātis* had to be rendered hexatonic and pentatonic in such a way so as to not effect the *saṁvādi*.[142]

Ṣaḍjagrāmikī jātis name	*Aṁśa*	*Nyāsa*	*Apanyāsa*	Hexatonic (notes dropped)	Pentatonic (notes dropped)	Weak Notes	Strong Notes	Movement of Notes
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Ṣāḍjī[143]	sa, ga, ma, pa, dha	sa	ga, pa	ni	—	ni, ri	ga[144]	from sa to ga from dha to sa
2. Ārṣabhī[145]	ri, dha, ni	ri	dha, ri, ni	sa[146]	sa, pa	—	—	—
3. Dhaivatī[147]	ri, dha	dha	dha, ri, ma	pa	sa, pa[148]	—	ga[149]	—
4. Naiṣādī[150]	ni, ga, ri	ni	ni, ga, ri	pa	sa, pa	—	—	—
5. Ṣaḍjakaiśikī[151]	sa, ga, pa	ga	sa, pa, ni	x	x	ri, ma[152]	—	—
6. Ṣaḍjodicyavā[153]	sa, ma, ni, dha	ma	sa, dha	ri	ri, pa[154]	—	sa(ri) ga[155]	movement of *aṁśa* notes--sa, ma, dha, ni
7. Ṣaḍja-madhyamā[156]	sa, ri, ga, ma pa, dha, ni	sa, ma	all notes *apanyāsa*	ni	ni, ga	—	—	*sañcāra* of all notes
Madhyama-Grāmikī Jātis								
8. Gāndhārī[157]	sa, ga, ma, pa, ni	ga	sa, pa	ri	ri, dha[158]	ri, dha	—	notes should be associated with *aṁśa* and *nyāsa*[159]
9. Rakta-gāndhārī[160]	sa, ga, ma, pa, ni	ga	ma	ri	ri, dha	ni, dha[161]	—	sa and ma movement[162]
10. Gāndhāro-dicyavā[163]	sa, ma	As in ma	Ṣaḍjodicyavā sa, dha[164]	ri	x	ga in the *mandra*[165]	—	*sañcāra* between the two *aṁśa* notes[166]

11. Madhyamā[167]	sa, ri, ma, pa, dha	ma	sa, ri, ma, pa, dha	ga	ga, ni	ga	sa, ma	—
12. Madhyamo-dīcyava[168]	pa[169]	ma	sa, dha[170]	x	x	—	ma, ga[171]	
13. Pañcamī[172]	ri, pa	pa	ni, ri	ga	ga, ni	sa, ga, ma	—	(a) ma- ri-*saṅgatā*[173] (b) ni- ga
14. Gāndhāra-pañcamī[174]	pa	pa	ri, pa	x	x	—	—	(a) ri-dha[175] (b) ma-ri (c) ni, ga
15. Āndhrī[176]	pa. ri, ga, ni	ga	ri, pa, ga, ni	sa	x	sa[177]	—	(a) ga-ri-*sañcara* (b) ni-dha[178]
16. Nandayantī[179]	pa-*aṁśa* ga-*graha*[180]	ga	ma, pa	sa	x	—	—	(a) *laṅghana* of *ṛṣabha* in *mandra*[181] (b) movement of only upto *tara* sa not beyond[182]
17. Kārmāravī[183]	ri,pa,dha,ni	pa	ri, pa, dha,ni	x	x	x	*anaṁśā*[184]	Prolific movement of *gandhāra* everywhere[185]
18. Kaiśikī[186]	sa, ga, ma, pa, dha, ni	ga, ni, pa[187]	sa, ga, ma, pa, dha, ni (ri)[188]	ri	ri, dha	ri	pa,ni	*sañcāra* like that of *ṣaḍja-madhyamā*[189]

Varna

The concept of *varṇa* was basically related to song. *Varṇa* was inseparably connected with the *padas* (words) in a song. The melodic movement of notes in which a single word was sung was the unit of *varṇa*, so that every word in a song demarcated one *varṇa*.

Abhinava says "*jāti* is indeed a mere pattern of notes. But the practice of *vastu* and *varṇa* depends on their relationship with *pada*. On that depends the *alaṁkāra (varṇa)* which is so inherently connected with *pada* that it cannot be defined without it."[196] Abhinava raises the problem that since *varṇas* have been included in the body of the *jāti* why have they not been mentioned along with the 10 *jāti lakṣaṇas* ?[191] He answers that *jātis* were basically a group of notes and both in *gāndharva* and *gāna* one finds musical rendering without words. But the *varṇa* cannot even be defined without relationship to the *pada*. He gives the examples of *graha* etc. which occur even without the *pada* in the *antarālāpa* etc.[192]

"The word *varṇa* denotes the expansion of action *(kriyā vistāra)*. Thus the action may be either by staying on one note or by ascending or discending or through a mixture. Hence there are 4 *varṇas* only and no more.. *Varṇa* is in reality the ascent, descent, staying and movement only. The *pada* which is thus sung is called *varṇa*," says Abhinava.[193]

Bharata classifies *varṇas* into four types—*ārchī*, *avarohī*, *sthāyī* and *sañcārī*.[194]

Ārohī varṇa consisted of ascending movements of notes i.e. ascending from low notes to high.

Avarohī was a descending movement.

Sañcārī was characterised by both ascending and descending movements. *Sthāyī* was to stay over a single note.[195] Abhinava remarks that in rendering this *varṇa*, the same note, whether in the high, middle or low octaves, should be repeated frequently. The rendering of the note should not be a continuous one for a long period, without any break, resembling the long drawn sound of a bell. He also suggests that when a note is emphasized by repetition, it did not lose its status of a *sthāyī* even if one or two other notes either higher or lower were sung along with it.[196] The *Vṛtti* on *Bṛhaddeśī* gives a similar exposition of the *sthāyī varṇa*.[197] The Vṛttikāra gives an example from the *ṣāḍjī jāti* to show that the *sthāyī* could employ more than one *svara* provided that the main impression created was that of the *sthāyī* note e.g. *sa ri sa*; *sa ri sa*. Śārṅgadeva held that *sthāyī varṇa* was characterised when the same note was put to a halting use i.e. halting on a note by a repetition.[198] But Kallinātha adds that notes

separately dwelt over in the same movement also constitute *sthāyī* such as *sa sa sa; ri ri ri.*

Varṇa was a concept relating basically to vocal music. Bharata says that *varṇas* arise from *śārīra* notes *Śārīrasvarasambhūtaḥ.*[199] Though primarily a vocal concept, it could also be rendered on instruments. Abhinava comments on the above phrase "(*varṇas*) are basically dependent on sung notes. But even on the *vīṇā*, one does find melodies rendered as resembling songs and thus *varṇas* are present there too; it is not that *alaṁkāras* (which depend on *varṇa*) are not played on *vīṇas.*"[200] Abhinava then quotes this verse—

Śārīryaṁ tvasphuṭā ye tu darvyam ve vyavasthitāḥ/
dārvyaṁ calita ye śārīryaṁ te suniścalāḥ.//[201]

i.e that which was indistinct in the *śārīrī* (*vīṇā* or vocal music) was clear in the *dāravī* (*vīṇā* or instrument). That which was unclear in the instrument could be well understood on the *śārīrī* i.e. vocal music. As examples may be cited the *tānas* and *śrutis* which were clear on the *vīṇā* and *varṇa* and *alaṁkāra* in vocal music.

Footnotes

1 *Śrutiśca nāma śrotragamyam vailakṣaṇyam yāvatā śabdenotpādyate. AB* on *NŚ*, 28, Vol. IV, p. 19.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 23.

3 *Atra kecit codyaṁ prati samādadhyuḥ—śrutikramābhivyaṁgyāḥ svarā iti śrutaya evādau vācyā iti codyaṁ tatrottaraṁ bhavedevaṁ yadi dhvaninādasaṁjñitāḥ śrutaya eva niyataśrutyantaratvena gṛhyamāṇaḥ svara (iti) na hyevaṁ. śrutayohyuccanīcatayā api svarāśrayā eva prātīyante yathā bhaṭṭamātṛguptaḥ—(jāyate) sahajenaiva samastaḥ śrutivistaraḥ svarādhaṣṭhānatoyāti śrotrapīyuṣasāratām. Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

4 *Tābhyaḥ kāścidupādāya gīyante sarvagītisu ādriyante ca ye tesu svaratvamupalabhyante svarāḥ ṣaḍjādayāḥ sapta. Dattila*, 10-11.

5 *Śrutayaśca vīṇāyāmevopayoginyaḥ sāraṇāyāstantryutkarṣaṇāpakarṣaṇasya tanmūlatvācca. Ibid.*, p. 9.

6 *Śrutinidarśanaṁ tu vīṇāyāṁ sphuṭam. Ibid.*, p. 13.

7 *Grāmavibhāgārthameva śrutikīrtanam. Ibid.*, p. 12.

8 *Evaṁ svaśrutyutkarṣādapakarṣādvā yadantaram mārdavāyatatvādvā tatpramāṇaṁ śrutiḥ nidarśanaṁ tvasāmabhivyākhyāsyamaḥ. Ibid.*, p. 20.

9 *L.c.*

10 *AB* on *NŚ*, IV, p. 21.

11 A. H. Fox Strangways, *The Music of Hindustan;* E. Clements, *Introduction to the Study of Indian Music*; Alain Danielou, *Introduc-*

tion to the Study of Musical Scales; Mark Levy, *Introduction to North Indian Music;* Ācārya Bṛhaspati, *Bharata kā Saṅgita-siddhānta.*

12 Clements, *op.cit.*, Chap. II.

13 Danielou, *op.cit.*, pp. 45-46, 125. He even explains Kohala's sixty-six *śrutis* as an elaboration of these 53, *op. cit.*, p. 132; cf. Mark Levy, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

14 Mark Levy, *op.cit.*, p. 141.

15 *NŚ*, 18.21. We have, however, taken up the topic of *śruti* first, because it is impossible to discuss the topic of *svara* without having discussed earlier the concept of *śruti.*

16 *Tatra svarānvaktumāha tatra svarā iti teṣūddiṣṭeṣu madhye svarā ucyanta iti śeṣaḥ na......vopatāpayoḥ svara ākṣepa ityanayoḥ svaraśabdaḥ, tena śabdasvabhāvaṁ cittavṛttimadhyasthatā—rūpasvāsthyāvasthāparityājanenopatāpavanto hṛdyatātiśayavaśāt svatāmākṣipantaḥ svaviṣaye abhidhānaṁ kurvataḥ svarā ityuktāḥ. AB* on *NŚ*, 28.21.

17 *Nanvevaṁ catuśruteradhikopyasti kiṁ bahunā ṣaḍjānniṣādaḥ prayujyamānaścadaśaśrutikaḥ syāt maivam tāvatīnāṁ śrutilābhe......tatsparśipavanābhihanana-janitanādāṁśopayogaḥ. Tataḥ svare tatkṛtaśca śrutisaṅkhyāniyamaḥ. Ata eva nirantaradhvanyaṁśaśravaṇe virūpasvaraṣrāvaṇam. Tata eva tisraḥ śrutayaḥ ṛṣabha ityādi vakṣyate na tu tṛtīyā śrutiriti. Ibid.*, IV, pp. 16-17.

18 *Taduktam Bhaṭṭatautena "śrutiḥ svaraḥ svasaṁvedya iti, gāne śrotrāṇām sarvatrāpi svarūpāvabhāsaḥ .....Na cāvayavaiḥ svarāḥ nāpisaṁcayaḥ yaugapadyābhāvāt. Kramikatvepi hi nairantaryāt nāśubhāvi (āśubhāvi) kṛtādyaugapadyābhimānaḥ kramikaśrutijanitasaṁskāraviśeṣa cānye śrutisthāne svarasamudaya ityāstāṁ tāvat. Ibid.*, p. 17.

19 *Tatrāntarālaśrutiṣu niyatasaṅkhyāsu īṣadyo vāyunā sparśastanmahimnā yaḥ svaraḥ śrutisthāne snigdhatvaraktatvalakṣaṇo dharmaḥ tasyāśryabhūtāyāḥ śruteruparañjakaḥ sa eva svara iti kecit. Ibid.*, p. 11. Cf. Lath, M., *A Study of Dattilam*, p. 210, where *snigdhatva* and *raktatva* are not distinguished. Actually *snigdhatva* here seems to refer to the unbrokeness and continuity of resonance whereas *raktatva* seems to refer to its accoustically pleasing effect. Dr. Lath opines that the resonance of the *svara* is to be understood within the laws of harmonics.

20 *Vayaṁ tu śrutisthānābhighātaprabhavaśabdaprabhāvitonuraṇanātmā snigdhamadhuraḥ śabda eva svara iti vakṣyāmaḥ. L.c.*

21 *Abhighātājācchabdādanantaram yonuraṇanalakṣaṇanyaḥ śabdaḥ upajāyate sa tāvannisargasnigdhamadhurākārāḥ. AB* on *NŚ*, 28.21.

22 *L.c.*

23 *NŚ*, Vol. IV, Ch. 28, p. 32.

24 *Kalatvācca kākalīsaṁjñaḥ*, says Bharata (*L.c.*), while defining *kākalī*. Abhinava elucidates thus—*īṣatkalastīvra-bhāvosmin*, i.e. a note slightly higher in pitch (*AB* on *NŚ*, IV, p. 35).

25 *Tatra saṁjñāvagrahaṇe bhedamāha vyavahārārthamime bhinne saṁjñe paramārthastu dvayorapitīvrataratva-kākalītvaṁ yadvakṣyati "kalatvācca kākalīsaṁjñā" iti dvayorapi cāntarasvaratvam ya-duk tam—sādhāraṇam nāmāntarasvaratā iti. AB* on *NŚ*, IV, Chap. 28, p. 32.

26 Abhinava explains *sādhāraṇa* (i.e. *svara sādhāraṇa*) thus—*Antare bhavaḥ antaraḥ svasthānācyutaprasthāna saṁkrāntaḥ sa cāsau svaraktatvaṁ na tu visvaraṁ tasya bhāvaḥ sādhāraṇamiti. AB* on *NŚ*, IV, Chap. 28, p. 31.

27 *NŚ*, IV, Chap. 28, p. 32.

28 *NŚ*, Chap. 28, 37-38; cf. *ibid.*, 28, 44-45.

29 Many *jātis* had multiple *aṁśas* but probably only one *aṁśa* was the acting *aṁśa* at a time. Thus *madhyamā* had five *aṁśas. viz. sa, ri, ma, pa, dha; pañcamī* had two *aṁśas*, *ri* and *pa*; *ṣaḍjamadhyamā* had also seven possible notes as *aṁśas*.

30 *AB* on *NŚ*, IV, 28. 45

31 *NŚ*, 28.125.

32 *AB* on *NŚ*, 28.45.

33 It seems that in an earlier period there were three *grāmas* current viz. *ṣaḍja-grāma*, *madhyama-grāma*, and *gāndhāra-grāma*. Nārada in his *Nāradīyaśikṣā* mentions the *gāndhāra-grāma* although says that it does not exist in this world, and is found only in the world of gods. *Nāradīyaśikṣā*, 1, 2, 7. This shows that even by Nārada's time, the *gāndhāra-grāma* had already become extinct. That it was definitely extinct by Bharata's time is proved by the fact that he does not even mention it.

34 *NŚ*, 28. 25-26.

35 *Madhyamagrāma tu pañcamaḥ śrutyapakṛṣṭaḥ kāryaḥ*—*NŚ*, 28 between 26-27 (Vol. IV, p. 20).

36 *Tataḥ paraṁ, caturādivyāvadhānetiprayatnavaśāddavisvaryamiti pañcaśrutikāderasaṁbhavaḥ*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 28.21.

37 *Kiṁ catuśśrutikenānekena tāvat-pradhānena bhavitayyam pūrṇatvāt tacca svaradvayameva pañcamasya catuśśrutikātvāvirāmāt kākalyantarayoścatuśśrutikatvam, vikāro na svabhāvaḥ tulyaṁ cānāśitvamiti dvāvevagrāma.*—*AB* on *NŚ*, Vol. IV, p. 21.

38 *Tatra svaramātrām kutracit dṛṣṭā.lṛṣṭayorupayogyapi tu tatsamūha eva tu prayo (gopayogi) tat svarāṇām samūhogrāma ityucyate. AB* on *NŚ*, IV, 28, p. 18. Another significant statement, which shows that the Indian system did not believe in the notion of absolute

pitch occurs in a commentary of *Dattilam*, the *Prabandhastabaka*, and is quoted by Siṁhabhūpāla (on *SR*, 1-4, 15-16). The quoted part concurs with *Dattilam*, 12, and is relevant to this discussion. —*Ṣaḍjatvena ṣaḍjasvarabhāvena gṛhītaḥ parikalpito buddhyā vyavasthāpito yaḥ kaścid dhvaniviśeṣaḥ ṣaḍjākhye grāme bhavettasmād dhvaniviśeṣādūrdhvaṁ tṛtīyaḥ syādṛṣabhaḥ iti*, i.e. "some sound may be arbitrarily chosen and fixed as the *ṣaḍja svara*, from that particular sound in the *ṣaḍja-grāma* the third higher (*śruti*) is the *ṛṣabha*."

39 *Caturvidhtvameteṣāṁ vijñeyaṁ gānayoktṛbhiḥ vādī caivātha śaṁvādī vivādī cānuvādyapi.*

40 *NŚ*, Vol. IV, 28, p. 15.

41 *AB* on *NŚ*, Vol. IV, 28, p. 16.

42 *Yo'tyantabahulo yatra vādī vāṁśaśca tatra śaḥ. Dattilam*, 18.

43 *Bṛhaddeśī* (Trivandrum, 1928), p. 13. '*Vadanāt Svāmivat*'.

44 *Vādi rājātra gīyate*; *Saṅgītaratnākara*, I. 3,50. See also *Caturvidhāḥ svarā vādī saṁvādī ca vivādyapi anuvādī ca vādī tu prayoge bahulāḥ svarāḥ Ibid.*, I, 3, 47.

45 *Sa tatra vādī svarāḥ yaḥ bahulaḥ san sakalagitasarthabhogapūrakaḥ. Bharatabhāṣyam* (Khairagarh, ed.), 6,49.

46 *Prayoge jātirāgādau bahula bāhulyena ya uccāryate so'ṁśasvarāparaparyāyo vādī.* Sudhakara comm., *Saṅgītaratnākara*, 1,3,47.

47 *Prādhānyādvādiśabdavācyam. Anyaiḥ lakṣaṇaih aṁśa-śabdavācyām.* Kallinātha, *SR*, I. p. 183.

48 *Paryāyāṁśe vādibhutāṁśād vyatiriktāṁśe—Ibid.*, p. 190.

49 *Te paryāyeṇa vādinaḥ grahāḥ ca bhavanti—Ibid.*, p. 186.

50 *Yayośca nāvakatrayodaśakamantaram tavanyonyām saṁvādinau. NŚ*, 28, Vol. IV, p. 15.

51 The formation of the two *grāmas* varied not just because of different *śruti* intrvals between some notes, but also because of the *saṁvāda* schemes being slightly different.

52 *NŚ*. IV, 28, p. 15.

53 *Mithaḥ saṁvādinau jñeyau trayodaśanavāntarau—Dattilam*, 18.

54 *Śrutayo dvādaśāṣṭau va yayorantaragocaraḥ mithaḥ saṁvādinautau... Saṅgītaratnākara*, 1 3,48-49.

55 *AB* on *NŚ*, Vol. IV, Ch. 28, p. 16.

56 *Madhyamaniṣādayorna saṁvāditvam satyapi trayodaśanavāntaratve.. AB* on *NŚ*, IV, Ch. 28, p. 17.

57 *L c.*

58 *L.c.*

59 *Vivādinastu te yeṣām dviśrutikamantaram tadyathā ṛṣabbagāndhārau dhaivata-niṣādau—NŚ*, 28, p. 15.

60 *Vādisaṁvādivivādiṣu sthāpiteṣu śeṣāstvanuvādinaḥ*—*NŚ*, 28, p. 15.
61 *NŚ*, 28, IV, p. 15.
62 *Kramayuktāḥ svarāḥ sapta mūrcchanetyabhisaṁjñitāḥ* –*NŚ*, 28.32.
63 *NŚ*, 28, 27-28.
64 *NŚ*, 28.31.
65 *NŚ*, Ch. 28, Vol. IV, p. 25.
66 Bṛhaspati, *Bhārata kā Saṅgīta-siddhānta*, p. 37.
67 *Ibid.*, pp. 37-38.
68 *SR* (Adyar ed.), *Svarādhyāya*, p. 115.
69 Siṁhabhūpāla gives the view of Dattila and Mataṅga. He says—*Motaṅgadattilau tu murcchanānamanyathā caturvidhyamavādiṣṭām. Yadāha Mataṇgaḥ*—*Tatra saptasvarā mūrcchanāḥcaturvidhāḥ pūrṇā, ṣaḍbhiḥ svaraiḥ yā gīyate sā ṣāḍavā, pañcabhiḥ svaraiḥ yā gīyate sauḍuvitā, kākalyantaraiḥ svaraiḥ yā gīyate sā sādhāraṇī iti. Dattilo pyāha*—*Sarvāstāḥ pañcasaṭpūrṇā sādhāraṇakṛtāḥ smṛtāḥ*—Siṁhabhūpāla on *SR*, (Adyar ed), *Svarādhyāya*, p. 114.
70 *AB* on *NŚ*, IV, p. 25.
71 *NŚ*, Ch. 28, Vol. IV, p. 26.
72 *Bṛ.*, 118.
73 *Bṛhaddeśī*, 118; *Vṛtti*, pp. 32-33.
74 Cf. Bṛhaspati, *op.cit.*
75 Kumbhā as quoted in *Bharatakośa*, p. 289.
76 *NŚ*, 28, p. 27.
77 *AB* ad *ibid. L.c.*
78 *AB*, Ch. 28, pp. 8-9.
79 *Ibid.*, p 30.
80 *Nanu ca mūrcchanāstāvat jātigrahabhāṣāvanna prayogopayoginyaḥ tānāśca kutapa upayujyante*—*AB* ad *NŚ*, IV, Chap. 28, p. 29.
81 *NŚ*, Vol. Ch. 28, p. 27.
82 *Ityeta mūrcchanāḥ proktāḥ sūraṇāścaiva vaiśikāḥ* (*vaiṇikāḥ*?), *Dattilam*, 29.
83 *Jñātvā jātyaṁśabāhulyaṁ nirdeśyā mūrcchanā budhaiḥ*—quoted Kāśyapa, *SR*, *Rāgādhyāya*, Kallinātha, p. 32.
84 *Śārīryām dāravyām ca tulyā mūrcchanā*–*AB* ad *NŚ*, IV, Chap. 28, p. 8.
85 *Ibid.*, p. 30.
86 *Tathā hi śrūyate, 'uttaramandrayā svatvaṁ saṁhṛtāstisrogāthā gāyet'tāḥ patyo (patnyo?) vā pāṭalikābhirupagāyanti' ityādita iti*—*Ibid.*, p. 24. '*Pāṭalikā*' appears to be a Vedic *mūrcchanā*. Its identification has not yet been made.
86[a] *Mūrcchanā pañcamādiḥ. AB* (GOS ed.), 28, p. 55.
87 *Tatraikānnapañcāśat ṣaṭsvarāḥ pañcatriṁśat pañcasvarāḥ*—*NŚ*, IV,

Ch. 28. p. 27.

88 This is stated clearly by Dattila thus—*Pañcasvarāḥ ṣaṭsvarāśca mūrcchanā yāḥ prakīrtitāḥ tānaścaturāsitistu ta evāptairudāhṛtāḥ. Dattila.* 30. For difference between *mūrcchanā* and *tāna*, see under *mūrcchanā*.

89 *Lakṣaṇaṁ tu ṣaṭsvarāṇām saptavidham ṣaḍjārṣabhaniṣādapañcamahīnāścatvāraḥ ṣadjagrāme. Maḍhyamagrāme tu ṣaḍjarṣbhagāndhārahīnāstrayaḥ Evamete ṣaṭsvarāh sarvāsu mūrcchanāsu kriyamāṇā bhavantyekānnapañcāśat tānāḥ*—*NŚ*, IV, Ch. 28, p. 27.

It may be noted that the omitting of note was governed by rigid rules in *gāndharva* music. The note ma was indispensable, and was never to be dropped in either *grāma*. Thus while discussing the *ṣaḍavita* and *auḍvita* of *jātis*, Bharata says—*Na madhyamasya nāśastu kartavyo hi kadācana sarvasvarāṇām hi pravaro hyanāśī madhyamaḥ smṛtaḥ gāndharvavikalpe hi vihitaḥ sāmasvapi ca madhyamaḥ. NŚ*, 28.65.

In the *grāmas*, these notes should be known as indestructible. *Pañcamaṁ madhyamagrāme ṣaḍjgrāme tu dhaivataṁ anāśinaṁ vijāniyatsarvatraiva tu madhyamam.* See also Lath, M., *A Study of Dattilam*, Datt 20, quoted in *AB* 28, p.27, pp. 235-36.

Abhinavagupta quoting from Dattila's work says that *pañcama* in the *madhyama grāma*, *dhaivata* in the *ṣaḍja grāma madhyama* in both.

90 *NŚ*, 28, p. 27.

91 *Tānaṁ tu śarīryaṁ sambhavadāpi na ptayogārhamasukhāvahatvat. Abhyāsārtham ca tatprayogeṣvanyūnādhikavaiṇasvaraśenaiva tatsiddheḥ Ata eva śārīrasvaraprayogāśakto-pi hṛdayāparigṛhītasvaraviśeṣaḥ śaknoti vainasvarān prayoktum. AB*, IV, Ch. 28, pp. 8-9.

Dr. Mukund Lath translates the last line thus, "one who cannot produce the notes through his voice, due to being unable to comprehend a particular note in his mind, can easily render these notes on the *viṇā*." *A Study of Dattilam*, p. 17.

It should be pointed out here that the basic precondition for producing a note, either through the human voice or on the instrument is that the comprehension of the note should be there in the mind. If the note has not been comprehended by the mind then one would not only be unable to sing the note, but would also be unable to play it on the instrument. Hence we suggest that *hṛdayāparigṛhīta-svaraviśeṣaḥ* is perhaps a mistake and should be read as '*hṛdayaparigṛhīta-svaraviśeṣaḥ*'. This reading would be a more happy one.

92 *Dividhā ca tānakriyā tantryāṁ provesānnigrahācca. Tatra praveśa-*

nam madhurā (adharā?) svara viprakarṣād uttaramārdavādvā—*NŚ*, IV, Ch. 28, p. 20.

Madhura here is perhaps a mistake for *adhara*. It would then contrast with *uttara* and thus make the meaning quite explicit. *Madhura* here does not make much sense and does not even help elucidate the method of *praveśa-tanakriyā*. It may be noted that M. M. Ghosh, too, in his translation of the *NŚ*, has taken the word to be *adhara*. Ghosh, M.M., translation of the *NŚ*, p.12.

93 *Tānārthakriyā ityarthaḥ. Aparasya ṛṣabhāpekṣayā ṣaḍjasya viprakarṣaḥ pīḍanamṛṣābhāpavādanam Tasyaiva niṣādapekṣayottaramandrayā niṣādotpādanam, tadatra yo balavān prayoge bhavati tatra avalopyantarbhāvaḥ sa hi dārṣṭatāmevam vrajet. AB* on *NŚ*, IV, Ch. 28. p. 27.

94 *NŚ*, 17.104.

95 *NŚ*, 17.106. Also—*Sarveṣamapyeṣām mandra-madhyatārakṛtāḥ prayogāstristhānagatāḥ. NŚ*, 17.130.

96 *NŚ*, 17.114.

97 *AB* on *NŚ*, 17.114.

98 For details, see under the topic '*Mūrcchanā*'.

99 *NŚ*, 28.46. Abhinava explains '*samavāya*' as constituting of *śrutis* and *svaras* grouped together on the basis of *graha* etc.—*Nirhetau samavāyātśrutisvaragrahādisamūhādyato jāyante tato jāyata iti caturviṁśatiḥ nirvacanam. AB* ad *NŚ*, *l.c.*

100 *Daśakam jātilakṣaṇam*—
Grahāṁśau tāramandrau ca nyāsopanyāsa eva ca/
alpatvaṁ ca bahutvaṁ ca ṣāḍavauḍuvite tathā//—*NŚ*, 28.66.

101 *Ibid.*, 28.67.

102 *Dattilam*, 57.

103 *Bṛhaddeśī*, p. 66.

104 Ghosh, M.M., translation of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, Vol. II, p. 19.

105 *AB* on *NŚ*, 28.66.

106 *Ibid.*, 28.67.

107 The *Vṛtti* on *Bṛhaddeśī* distinguishes between the functions of *graha* and *aṁśa*—*Tatrādau jātyādiprayogogṛhyate yenāsau grahaḥ* i.e. *graha* was the commencing note of a *jāti*. *Aṁśa* was the progenitor of a *rāga* , was more pervasive and thereby had greater primacy—*rāgajanakatvād vyāpakatvāccāṁśasyaiva prādhānyam, Vṛtti* on *Br.*, 197.

108 *NŚ*. 28. 67-69.

109 *NŚ*, 28. 79-91.

110 *NŚ*, 28.70. Kallinātha, in his commentary (on *SR*, 1, 7, 35-36) says that the limit of *tara* movement in the *ṣaḍja-grāma* was up

to the fifth note from the *aṁśa* whereas in the *madhyama-grāma*, this limit was only upto the fourth note. This, however, has not been stated by anyone else.

111 *Aṁśasvareṇa saha tāvattārasapta(ka) gatāḥ pañca catvāro vā svarāḥ kāryāḥ. Yathā Ṣaḍjāṁśe sa ri ga ma pa, gāndhāre ga ma pa dha ni madhyame ga ma pa dha ni evaṁ pañcamadhaivataniṣādeṣu. Eta eveti tallakṣayeṇa (sthāpyate).—AB* on *NŚ*, 28.70.

112 *AB* on *NŚ*, 28.70.

113 *NŚ*, 28.34.

114 *Tridhā mandragatiḥ aṁśaparā nyāsa-parā aparanyāsaparā ceti*........ *gāndhārenyāsaliṅge tu dṛṣṭamarṣabhasevanam—NŚ*, 28, p 46.

115 Ācārya Bṛhaspati has taken *aparanyāsaparā* to be *apanyāsāpara* and hence according to him the third possible lower limit is the *apanyāsa.*

116 *NŚ*, 28.72.

117 *Asyāṁ jātiśarīrasamāptau kartavyatāyam vā svaraḥ sanyāsaḥ, tarhi asyate prayogo yeneti nyāsaḥ.—AB* ad *NŚ*, *l.c.*
Aṅgasamāptau nyāsaḥ tadvadapanyāso hyaṅgamadhye—NŚ, 28.72.

118 *AB* ad *NŚ*, *l.c.*

119 *Dvividhamalpatvam laṅghanādanābhyāsācca—NŚ*, 28.72; 28.74.

120 *AB*, *ibid.*

121 *L.c.* Cf. also *Īṣatsparśo laṅghane syātprāyastallopyagocaram—SR*, 1,7,51.

122 *AB* on *NŚ*, 28.74.

123 *NŚ*, 28.74.

124 *Alpatvetha bahutve balavadabalatā-viniścayādevā—L.c.*

125 *Abalamalpaṁ tadviparyādbalavāditi bahntvāllakṣaṇaṁ gamyata eva. AB, ibid.*

126 *L.c.*

127 *Tacca jātisvaraiḥ paryāyāṁśair-saṁvādibhiścopalakṣitaḥ (kṣyate). L.c.* The term *paryāyāṁśa* has not been mentioned in the *NŚ*, but has been mentioned in the *AB* and other later texts.

128 *NŚ*, 28.76.

129 *SR*, 1, 7, 29-30.

130 *Tatra prathama-vidārīmadhye nyāsasvaraprayuktāstu. Vivādanaśīlaṁ muktvā sannyāsaḥ so'bhidhātavyaḥ kṛtvā padāvasāne vinyāsāt kvāpi vinyāsaḥ—NŚ*, 28.73.

131 *Prathamāyā vidāryā madhye nyāstvobhāk svaraḥ na cedāṁśavivādī syāt sannyāsaḥ so'bhidhiyate—Dattilam*, 141.
Aṁsavivādī gītasyādyavidārīsamāptikṛt sannyāsoṁśavivādyeva—SR, 1,7,47.

132 See fn. 130. Dattila has not mentioned *vinyāsa.*

133 *Aṁśasya saṁvādyanuvādī vā kāpi vidāribhāva (? ga) rūpasya padasya padānte vinyasnate tadā vinyāsaḥ*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 28.73. *Vinyāsaḥ tu kathyate yo vidāribhāgarūpāpaprānte vātiṣṭhate*—*SR*, 1,7,48.

134 *NŚ*, 28.75.

135 *NŚ*, 28.40-43.

136 *Ibid.*, 28.44-45.

137 *NŚ*, Ch. 28. p. 37.

138 *Vikṛtā lakṣyante tebhyonyatamena dvābhyāṁ bahubhirvālakṣaṇair vikriyāmupagatā nyāsavarjaṁ vikṛtasaṁjñā bhavanti. Nyāsavidhāvapyāsāṁ mandro niyamaḥ* —*l.c.*

139 *Tatraikādaśasaṁsargajā vikṛtā aparaspara-saṁsargādekādaśa nirvartayanti*—*NŚ*, Ch. 28, p. 37.

140 *NŚ*, Ch. 28, p. 38.

141 Mukund Lath seems to have in mind three types of *jātis*, the *śuddhas* and their *vikṛtas* and their *saṅkaras*—Lath, M., *A Study of Dattilam*, pp. 265-78. Thus he does not take the *saṅkara* or *saṁsargaja* to betoken the combination of *jātis* (*śuddhas*) giving rise to the *vikṛtas*, but he understands it to signify a particular class of *jāti*, and that too which was different from the *vikṛtas*. What is more, he states that Bharata and Abhinava hold that these *saṁsargajas* were born out of *vikṛta jātis* and never the *śuddhas*. It may be stated that neither Bharata nor Abhinava have made any statement to this effect. Bharata says—*Tatraikādaśasaṁsargajā vikṛtā(a) parasparasaṁsargādekādaśa nirvartayanti* (*NŚ*, 28, p. 37). Thus 11 *saṁsargaja* (born out of combination), *vikṛta* (altered) out of mutual combination. If it meant a combination of *vikṛtas* it should have been *vikṛtānāṁ saṁsargāt*; *vikṛta*, however, is in nominative, so also *saṁsargaja*. Hence *vikṛta* and *saṁsargaja* should be taken to qualify each other. Moreover, in the following verse Bharata again speaks of only two types of *jātis*—*śuddha* and *vikṛta*—"*Śuddhā vikṛtāśca samvāyājjātaystu jāyante punarevāśuddhakṛtā bhavanteyathaikādaśānyāstu*—'*ca*' is after '*vikṛtāḥ*', it is not *samvāyājjātayaśca*. That *samvāyājjātayastu* should qualify '*vikṛtāḥ*' is made explicit in the second line where those 11 *jātis*, Bharata says, are the pure ones altered (*aśuddhakṛta*).

In fact, it may be noted that the parent *jātis* of the *saṁsargajas* as described by Bharata and others, are all only *śuddhas*, and not any other. Again, we know that the *vikṛtas* arose out of the *śuddhas*. It follows logically that both are the same.

Dr. Lath says "Abhinava is categorical that the modified *jātis* alone (and not the *śuddha* ones) give rise to the *saṅkaras* (*vikṛtā iti na tu śuddhā ityarthaḥ*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 28.46). *A Study of Dattilam*, p. 267.

But when the entire context, from which this phrase has been taken, is discussed it will be seen that the meaning which emerges is quite different. Abhinava says—*Nanvevam saptānām vibhāga uktaḥ aṣṭādaśacoddiṣṭaityāśaṁkyāha tatreti. Evaṁ saptasu sthitāsvityarthaḥ. Tāsāṁ saṁsargādityāha vikṛtā iti na tu śuddhā. Ekādaśeti karmapadam*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 28.46. This may be translated thus : "Objection. This (i.e. this refers to the *śuddhas*) describes the division of the seven (*jātis*), but eighteen have been listed. In these 7, that is the meaning (what he means is that the remaining 11 are born out of these 7, hence contained in them). Of their (i.e. of the 7) combinations (are) the seven, i.e. they are *śuddha* or pure (what Abhinava means here is that though born out of the *śuddha* they themselves are not *śuddha* or pure, but become *vikṛta* i.e. undergo alterations). Then again Abhinava says "*Śuddhā vikṛtāśceti vibhāgaḥ. Evakareṇa śuddhānām hi vikṛtatvam*" (*L.c.*) i.e. "*śuddha* and *vikṛta*, this is the division. '*Eva*' shows that the *vikṛtatva* is of the *śuddhas* alone."

About the *vikṛtas*, M.M. Ghosh, too, translates thus : "The modified *jātis* are eleven in number and they grow from combinations. (These) eleven are formed from their mutual combination as follows :

Jātis are pure as well as modified and the (latter) arise from the combination (of other *jātis*). Among them seven are pure while the remaining eleven are modified." Ghosh, M.M., translation of the *NŚ*, p. 16.

Ācārya Bṛhaspati, too, has taken these to be basically only two classes of *jātis*—*śuddha* and *vikṛta*—Bṛhaspati, *Bharata ke Saṅgīta-siddhānta kā Itihāsa*, p. 75.

Cf. "It is not only interesting but also instructive to consult Bharata who seems to have been the author of the concept of *jātis* and their classification. He distinguishes *jātis* primarily into two classes, viz. those that are named after their denomination notes which he calls *svara-jātis* and which can only be seven; and those eleven that are formed by the combination of these *svara-jātis* in their modified forms, which he calls *saṁsargaja vikṛta* (combinations of modified *jātis*)"—Shringy, R.K.; Sharma, Prem Lata, *Saṅgīta Ratnākara of Śārṅgadeva*, text and translation, Vol. I, p. 271.

It may, however, again be pointed out that these 11 were born from combination of *śuddha jātis*. In combining various *jātis* they are bound to undergo some alteration or *vikṛtatva*. The idea of *vikṛta* and *saṁsargaja* being different is suggested in the *SR*, 1.7, a text much later than Bharata. Though Śārṅgadeva there says

that the *saṁsargajas* are born of *vikṛtas* (*SR*, 1. 7, 8) but, their actual, detailed description shows that the names of their parent *jātis* are the same as the 7 *śuddhas*.

142 Bharata mentions the '*saṁvādyalopa*' in context of the *ṣāḍja-madhyamā*, but it was a general maxim applying to most *jātis*.

143 *NŚ*, 28. 95-97. Cf. *Bṛ*., 201-202.

144 *Gāndhārāsya ca bāhulyam. Ibid*., 28. 97.

145 *NŚ*, 28. 98. Cf. *Bṛ*., 203. Abhinavagupta mentions the *saṅgatis* of *sa* and *dha*; and *ri* and *ga* in this *jāti—sadhaurigau saṅgacchete*, *AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 98.

Also when the *jāti* was *pūrṇa*, *sa*, *ga*, *pa*, were *alpa* notes; when *auḍuvita*, *ga* and *ma* were weak notes according to some there was *laṅghana of pañcama—tatra kecit pañcamasya laṅghanamāhuḥ*. "*Pūrṇāvasthāyām ṣaḍjagāndhārapañcamā alpatvam bhajante auḍuvite ca gamayoralpatā*." *L.c.*

146 *Ṣaḍjahīne ṣāḍavaḥ*, *l.c.*

147 *NŚ*, 28. 99-101. The *Vṛtti* on *Bṛ*., p. 71, gives the *dhaivatādi mūrcchanā* for this *jāti*. This would be *uttaramandrā*.

148 Abhinava says that in the full form *sa* and *pa* are to be employed in *āroha* by *laṅghana* (i.e. by gliding over them and not resting). By *lopyatvāt*, he says, is signified that they can be glided over, but, again they are strong notes. This seems contradictory. But at another place Abhinava explaining the use of *laṅghana* in the *pūrṇāvasthā* says, "where in the *pūrṇāvasthā* a *lopya svara* is employed there that note is frequently glided over."—*lopya svarapurṇāvasthā ya yadā prayujyate tadā tasya bāhulyena laṅghanam*. *AB*, Ch. 28, p. 48. Cf. *Īṣatsparśo laṅghane syātprāyastallopyagocaram*. *SR*, 1, 7, 51.

This would mean that in the *pūrṇāvasthā*, even though a *lopyasvara*, because of frequently gliding over, it tends to attain prominence—*pūrṇadaśāyām ca pa sa itya (sāvityā) rohavarṇagatau kāryau lopyatvāllaṅghanam siddhamapi punaḥ prakarṣalābhatvamuktam*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 101.

149 Cf. Ghosh—"*niṣāda* and *ṛṣabha* should be skipped over and *gāndhāra* should be amplified"—Translation of the *NŚ*, p. 25. Bṛhaspati—*Ni*, *ri* and *ga* are strong in this *jāti*. *Bharata ke Saṅgīta-siddhānta kā Itihāsa*, p. 105.

Cf. Lath—"Bharata adds that *gāndhāra* was strong"—*A study of Dattilam*, p. 281. Abhinava also says that this *jāti* was sung in the *mūrcchanā* beginning with *pañcama*. *AB*. *ibid*.

150 *NŚ*, 28. 102-103. Bharata says that its hexatonic and pentatonic treatments were all to be the same as *gāndharādi mūrcchanā*, *Vṛtti*

Bṛ., p. 71. Cf. *Bṛ*., 205. *Dhaivativad bhavecheso.*

151 *NŚ*, 28. 104-105. There was no hexatonic or pentatonic treatment of this *jāti*.

152 *Ri* is accepted by all as weak, '*ṛṣabho*' *lpaprayogaḥ. Bṛ*., 207. The commentary says '*madhyamānām alpatvam ṛṣabhasyalpataratvam śeṣanam bahutram*, *Vṛtti* on *Bṛ*., p. 72. i.e. *ma* is a weak note, but *ri* is weaker, rest are strong. *Dattilam*, 69 has *ṛṣabho*' *lpaprayogaḥ*; GOS ed. of the *NŚ* has '*daurbalyamatra kartavyam dhaivata madhyamasyarṣabhasya. NŚ*, 28. 105. '*dhaivata*' as a weak note here seems to be a mistake. It has not been mentioned by anyone. Abhinava too speaks of only *madhyama* and *ṛṣabha* as weak notes —*madhyamarṣabhayordaurbalyam. AB, ibid.* He, in fact says that *dha* and *ni* are somewhat prolific here—*nidhayortra kiñcidadhikyamiti, l.c.*

153 *NŚ*, 28. 106-109.

154 Normally, the *saṁvādī* of the note that is dropped in the hexatonic rendering, is the one to be dropped as the other note in the pentatonic rendering of the *jāti*. Here, we may note an exception in the dropping of *pañcama* in the pentatonic rendering of the *ṣaḍjodicyavā* for *ri-pa* is *madhyamagrāmika saṁvādī* scheme. The *saṁvādī* of *ṛṣabha* (the note dropped in *ṣāḍavita* here) is *dhaivata* and hence that should have been omitted. Probably, the difficulty lay in the fact that though *dha* is the *saṁvādī* of *ri*, it i.e. *dha*, could not be omitted in the *ṣaḍja-grāma—ṛṣabhaḥ saṁvādī dhaivatasya ṣaḍjagrāme na lopyamāne yataḥ. AB*. p. 56.

155 *Ṣaḍjaścāpyarṣabhaścaiva gāndhāraśca balī bhavet/*
gāndhārasya ca bāhulyam mandrasthāne vidhīyate//—*NŚ*, 28. 109.

Gāndhāra, though not an *aṁśa*, was a strong note in this *jāti*, and was employed prolifically in the *mandra sthāna*. The same has been opined by Dattila too—*mandragāndhārabhūyas*..*Dattila*. 71. Bharata, has, however, mentioned two other strong notes—*ri* and *sa*. *Ri*, though weak, is on the contrary termed strong here. *Sa*, of course, would be strong, being an *aṁśa*. Thus says Abhinava—"*Sarigāḥ balinaḥ. Anyā (ṣaḍja) svaṁśatvāt siddham balitvam punaradhikayārthamuktam. Ṛṣabhasyātyalpatvam prāptam pratiṣeddhum/ gāndhārasya mandrasthāne bāhulyam. AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 106-109. Here Abhinava calls *ri* '*atyalpa*'.

156 *NŚ*, 28. 110-112.

157 *NŚ*, 28.113-115. The *Vṛtti* on *Bṛ*., p.73, says that it was *mūrcchanā* sung to the *dhaivatādi*.

158 Here is another exception to the omission of the *saṁvādī* in the pentatonic rendering of the *jāti*. In *madhyama-grāma*, *pañcama* is

a *saṁvādī* of *ṛṣabha*, and hence that should have been dropped. But again, the difficulty encountered is that *pa* is indispensible in the *madhyama-grāma* and cannot be dropped—*pañcamasya grāme hyalopyatvam*. *AB*, *ibid.*

159 Abhinava explains "*vihitāstviti gāndhāryāḥ svaranyāsāṁśagocaraḥ*" (*NŚ*, 28. 115) as "*anyeṣām svarāṇām nyāsasvaravisayo'm sasvaraviṣayaśca sañcāraḥ tadāha* '*svaranyāsaṁśagocara iti*' (*AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 113, 115) i.e. all notes which are not *aṁśa* or *nyāsa*, should in making *sañcāra* or movement, be associated with *nyāsa* or *aṁśa*.

160 *NŚ*, 28. 115-117. *Raktagāndhārī* shared many common characteristics with *gāndhārī*. They had the same *nyāsa*, *aṁśa*, and same notes dropped in the hexatonic and pentatonic renderings. The distinguishing features were the *apanyāsa*, the strong notes and *svara sañcāra*. It was also sung to a different *mūrcchanā*, the *mūrcchanā* beginning with *ri*. *Vṛtti*, *Bṛ*., p. 74.

161 *Dha*, inspite of being *lopya* and an *anaṁśa*, was strong. Mataṅga too mentions *ni* as a strong note. *Bṛ*., 214.

162 *NŚ* 28. 117. On this Abhinava comments that it should be skipped in moving from *sa* to *ga* and back, thus bringing these two notes together "*ṛṣabham collaṅghya sagetyanayoranyonyaikatvam melanam ca* (*AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 116-117).

163 *NŚ*, 28. 118-119.

164 *Antaramārga*, *nyāsa* and *apanyāsa* were the same as in *ṣaḍjodicyavati*. *NŚ*, 28. 119. However, the former had only 2 *aṁśas* (not four like the latter) and there was no pentatonic treatment of this *jāti*.

165 Abhinava says, "In the *mandra sthāna*, *gāndhāra* is prolifically used. "*Mandrasthāne gāndhārasya bhūyastvamiti sarvamatideśāt*", *AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 118-119—*mandrasthāne ca gāndhārabāhulyam dṛṣyate tathā.* —Nanyadeva quoted in *Bharatakośa*, p. 174.

166 *Antaramārga* (here) is the mutual *sañcāra* of the two *aṁśa svaras*—"*asyāmantaramārgaḥ parasparāṁśasvarayoḥ sañcāraḥ*"—*AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 118-119.

167 *NŚ*, 28. 120-122. *Gāndhāra* is to be omitted, yet it is again specifically said to be *laṅghanīya*.

169 *Ibid.*, 28. 123. *Madhyamodicyavā* was a septatonic *jāti*, and did not permit any hexatonic or pentatonic structures. Bharata says that it was similar to *gāndhārodicyavā*.

170 Abhinava gives *ma* as *nyāsa* and *sa*, *dha* as *apanyāsa*—'*apanyāsau sadhau ....nyāso maḥ*.'—*AB*, *ibid.* The *Vṛtti* on *Bṛ*. (p. 77) also says—'*asya madhyamo nyāsaḥ ṣaḍjadhaivatāvopanyasau*.'

171 Abhinava says '*madhyamagāndhārabāhulyam*' (*AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 123) i.e. *ma* and *ga* are prolific,

172 *NŚ*. 28. 124-126.

173 The Asiatic Society reading enjoins a *sañcāra* between *madhyama* and *ṛṣabha; "sañcāram madhyamasya ṛṣabhasya ca" (NŚ*, A.S. ed., 28. 133). However, the reading in the Gaekwad edition has a *pañcama ṛṣabha sañcāra*. Abhinava's commentary seems to lend support to the reading in the Asiatic Society ed.—"*rima (pa) ityanayoranyonyasangatiḥ*." (*AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 126). The bracket has been added by the editor and does not form part of the manuscript reading. Moreover, while commenting on verses 127-28, Abhinava clearly states that Bharata speaks of *saṅgati* between *ma* and *ri*—"*uktam madhyamarṣabhasaṅgatirniṣādādgāndhāra iti pañcamyām* " (*AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 127-128). Mataṅga. Dattila, Śārṅgadeva and Kumbhā, too, speak of *madhyama-ṛṣabha* movement.

(a) *madhyamarṣabhasya saṅgatiḥ, Bṛ*., 218.

(b) ....*madhyamarṣabha-saṅgatiḥ, Dattilam*, 80.

(c) *rimayoḥ saṅgatiḥ. SR*, 1, 7, 73.

(d) *rimayoḥ saṅgatiḥ kāryā, S. Raj*, 2, 1, 4, 258.

Ācārya Bṛhaspati says that since *ri-pa* were *saṁvādī*, why should Bharata mention their *saṅgati* specifically. Obviously *pa* is an editing mistake for *ma*—Bṛhaspati, *Bharata ke Saṅgīta-siddhānta kā Itihasa*, p. 103, fn. *Ga-ni* was a secondary movement. Bharata says it was less frequent—*Gāndhāra gamanaṁ caiva kāryaṁ tvalpaṁ ca saptamāt* (*NŚ*, 28. 126). Abhinava says that this *saṅgati* took place when the *jāti* was *pūrṇa* (for obviously these were the two notes dropped in the hexatonic and pentatonic renderings) —*pūrṇāvasthāyām caniṣādād 'gāndhāragamanam' tacca parimitam (AB, ibid.)*.

174 This *jāti* was always septatonic. The G.O.S. ed. has "*tāragatyā tu ṣaḍjopi kadācinnātivartate*" (*NŚ*, 28. 127) i.e. the movement of this *jāti* is never beyond the *tāra ṣaḍja*. But neither do the other editions have this, nor does Abhinava comment on this. In fact, Abhinava, and even Dattila mention this only for the *nandayantī jāti*.

175 The *sañcāra* in this *jāti*, says Bharata, was to be like *Gāndhārī* and *Pañcamī*.

176 Thus, commenting on this, Abhinava says—*Dhaivatagamanamṛṣabhāditi gāndhāryām (ryāḥ) sañcāraḥ. Uktam madhyamarṣabhasaṅgatirniṣādād gāndhāra iti pañcamyām. Asāvubhayo' pyasyām kāryāḥ. AB, ibid.*

177 *NŚ*, 28. 129-131.

178 Besides *ga-ri sañcāra*, another one which is mentioned in a rather obscure fashion : "*saptamasya ca ṣaṣṭhasya nyāso gatyānupūrvaśaḥ*"

(*NŚ*, 28. 131). i.e. *nyāsa* of *niṣāda* and *dhaivata*, in an orderly movement. Abhinava too, is not very clear. The *Vṛtti* on *Bṛ*. p. 79, however, clearly gives the *saṅgati* of *ri-ga*, and *ni-dha* in this *jāti*—*rigayornidhayostathā saṅgatir*. He also mentions the *mūrcchanā* beginning with *madhyama* for this *jāti*.

179 There was no pentatonic treatment of this *jāti*. Abhinava says that *Āndhrī* was born of *Gāndhārī* and *Ārṣabhī* and *Pañcamī jātis*—*gāndharyarṣarbhibhyamandhrī pañcamyamarṣabhi gāndhāribhirnandayantīti*. (*AB*, p. 62). Because of this they were similar—'*vayasya kāraṇatulyatvādāndhrivat*. (*l.c.*). But Abhinava says the *sañcāra* of these similar *jātis* was to be different—*tulyajāti karaṇikānām jātīnām saṅgatiratulyaiva kartavyati sūcayati*. (*l.c.*) This is logical, otherwise, how would similar *jātis* be distinguished ! Bharata says *nāndhrīsañcārāṇām bhavet*—*NŚ*, 28. 113. The *Vṛtti* on *Bṛ*., p. 80, gives the *hṛṣyakā mūrcchanā* for this *jāti*.

180 In all the *jātis*, *graha* and *aṁśa* were the same note (*NŚ*, 28. 67). *Nandayantī* was the only exception where *graha* and *aṁśa* were different. *Aṁśā* was *pañcama* and *graha* was *gāndhāra* (*NŚ*, 28. 132).

181 *Laṅghanam ṛṣabhasyāpi tacca mandragatam smṛtam* i.e. *laṅghana* of *ṛṣabha* in the *mandra*. *NŚ*, 28. 133. Dattila says "*Syānmandrarṣabhasañcāro laṅghanīyaśca sa kvacit*"—*Dattilam*, 86, i.e. *sañcāra* of *mandra ṛṣabha*. Mataṅga makes an identical statement. *Bṛ*., 225.

182 *Tāragatyā tu ṣaḍjastu kadācinnātivartate*—*NŚ*, 28. 134. Abhinava explains this as meaning that no note above the *sa* in the *tāra saptaka* should be touched. He, however, says that some held that the *tāra sa* itself was not to be touched, yet others held that its movement beyond *tāra sa* was optional.

183 "..... *gatyā ṣaḍjo nātivartate nātiśayyate tata ūrdhvakam na śirasyasaptakasvarāḥ prastāvyā ityarthaḥ. Anye tvācakṣate, ṣaḍjeva (ḍja eva) kadācinnātivartate nāroham bhajate tāram na kiñcit prastāvyamityarthaḥ. Kadācidite vaikalpiko'yam tāra ityarthaḥ.*" *AB*, *l.c.*

184 In *Kārmāravi*, the *anaṁśas* seem to be quite strong. Though the published text of the *NŚ* does not say so, Abhinava quotes Viśākhila who had stated that *anaṁśa* were prolific—"*vadāha Viśākhilācāryaḥ bāhulyādanaṁśānām viśeṣataḥ sarvato gāndhāragamanam.* —*AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 136. This view is held by later theorists too, who state that *anaṁśas* were dominant in the *antaramārga*—"*bahavo'ntaramārgatvādanaṁśaḥ parikīrtitāḥ*"—*Bṛ*., 268. Śārṅgadeva (*SR*, 1, 7, 101) says the same thing. "*Tathaivāntaramārgatvādanaṁśabahutā mata*", *S. Raj*., 2, 1, 4, 350. "*Tathā ca Bharataḥ-anaṁśa balavantastu nityameva prayogataḥ.*"—*Kalā* on *SR*, 1, 7, 101-102.

Kallinātha raises an important question—How were the *aṁśas* and *anaṁśas* to be distinguished if both were strong ? He answers that in the *antaramārga* the *aṁśas* were the notes emphasised in the *sthāyī varṇa (sthāyitvena)* and non-*aṁśas* were emphasised in *sañcārī varṇa (sañcāritvena)—yaḥ sthāyitvena bahuprayogaḥ so'ṁśaḥ, yastu sañcāritvena bahuprayogaḥ' sauntaramārgāśrayo' naṁśa it vivektavyam, l.c.*

185 *NŚ*, 28. 135-136. This was a septatonic *jāti*. "*Gāndhārasya viśeṣeṇa sarvato gamanam bhavet*"—*NŚ*, 28. 136. Abhinava comments thus: "*Sarvebhyopi viśeṣeṇa tu gāndhārasya yathāśakti saṅgatiḥ*" (*AB*, *ibid.*), i.e. one should associate all notes as much as possible with *gāndhāra*.

186 *NŚ*, 28. 137-140.

187 Bharata says "*dhaivateṁśe niṣāde ca nyāsaḥ pañcama iṣyate*" (*NŚ*, 28. 138). i.e. when *dha* and *ni* are acting as the *aṁśas*, *pa* (though actually not a *nyāsa*) can be made a *nyāsa*. The same thing is opined by Dattila (*Dattilam*, 89), Mataṅga (*Bṛ*., 262) and Śārṅgadeva (*SR*, 1, 7, 95).

188 *Apanyāsaḥ kadācittu ṛṣabhopi vidhīyate*—(*NŚ*, 28. 138). Though not an *apanyāsa*, *ṛṣabha* could sometimes be made one. Abhinava comments that *ṛṣabha* became an *apanyāsa* only when the *jāti* was *pūrṇa*—"*kadācittu ṛṣabhopīti, lopāvasthāyām tu nasaḥ. Tathā pūrṇadaśāyāṁ tu vā bhavatīti.*" *AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 137-140. Otherwise *ṛṣabha* was a weak note. Bharata expressly says that it was a weak note and *laṅghana* should apply to it (*NŚ*, 28. 140). It was also dropped in hexatonic and pentatonic renderings (*ibid.*, 28. 139).

189 Abhinava commenting on this, makes a peculiar statement. He says that the *sañcāra* in this *jāti* could be free as in *ṣaḍja-madhyama*, where *dhaivata* was the *aṁśa*.—*Ṣaḍjamadhyamāyām ca yathā cāha, dhaivatasvarāṁśāyāṁ yatheṣṭam sañcārastadvadiha. AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 138-140.

190 *AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 14.

191 *L.c.*

192 *Tarhi gīyamānapadabhāve kaścidapi svataḥ svaropayogo'sti gāne gāndharve va...... .....Kim tu varṇo nāma padasambandhamantareṇa lakṣayitumeva na śakyate......Grahādayaḥ ..... tathā ca padanirapekṣe'pyantarālāpādāvapi bhavatyeva...... l.c.*

193 *Etacca (vaṁca) kriyāvistāravācī varṇaśabdaḥ. Tathābhinayakriyā (?) ekasvaramātrāvasthānena vā ārohena vā avarohena vā vyāmiśratayā vā sampādyata iti catvāra eva varṇāḥ ....Tenārohaṇāvarohaṇāvasthānasañcāraṇānyevaparamārtho varṇāḥ tadyogāttu gīyamānaṁ padam varṇaka ityucyate. AB* ad *ibid.*, *l.c.*

194 *NŚ*, 29. 14.
195 *Ibid.*, 29. 15-16.
196 '*Samā*' *iti tulyajātīyāḥ. Tena mandratāramadhyamarūpatayā tasyaiva svarasya prayogaḥ. Sthāyyeva varṇaḥ vicchidya vicchidya punaḥ prayogaḥ kartavyo na tu dīrgheṇāvicchedena ghaṇṭāsvanavaditi darśayituṁ svarā iti bahuvacanaprayogaḥ. Svarā upasvarāśceti sarvaikaśeṣa iti kecit. Evantu gāndhāriṇyāyuktasvaradvayama pyārohaṇāvarohasthiratva (tād) vyatirekeṇa kathaṁ pratiyojyam. AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 16.
197 *Br.*, *Vṛtti* on 120.
198 *Sthitvā sthitvā prayogaḥ syadekasyaiva svarasya yaḥ/ Sthāyi varṇaḥ sa vijñeyaḥ padasyānvarthanāmakaḥ//*—*SR*, 1,6,2.
199 *NŚ*, 29. 17.
200 *Śarīrasvarasambhūtā*' *iti śarīrasvareṣu mukhyeṣvāśriteṣu lakṣaṇamidamuktam. Tatsadṛśasvaropalambhaevānyatra vīṇādāvīti tatrāpi paryavasyatīti na tu vīṇādāvalaṁkārābhāvaḥ. AB* ad *NŚ*, 29. 17.
201 *L.c.*

Chapter 9

Theatrical Music : Dhruvā-gāna

The musical section of the *NŚ* deals with two distinct systems of music—the system of *gāndharva* music and that of *dhruvā-gāna. Gāndharva* music may be said to represent the classical form of music of the times, while *dhruvā-gāna* was the music of the theatre, moulded to suit the structure and atmosphere of the dramatic plots. As yet, no work prior to that of Bharata's is available which gives such an elaborate discussion on the *dhruvās*. On the basis of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* itself, however, we can say that the tradition of *dhruvā-gāna* was an ancient one. Abhinava often mentions an ancient authority by the name of Kāśyapa in connection with *dhruvās*. In an interesting passage Abhinava says, "Nārada etc., who were educated in *gāndharva*, when they wished to create *gānayoga* and wanted to establish the *dhruvā* on the basis of *gāndharva*, said that this new complex which is useful for enjoyment is not produced by us by our own inventiveness nor perceived in the original (i.e., in the *gāndharva*) but it follows the authority of tradition."[1] Here, Abhinava attributes *dhruvā-gāna* to Nārada etc., but says that since they wanted to establish *dhruvā* on a firm basis they derived it from the tradition. The *Nāradīyaśikṣā*, as available now, however, deals only with *gāndharva* music, and does not say anything about *dhruvā-gāna*. It is possible that this portion might have been lost. Bharata has devoted one complete chapter for the discussion of *dhruvā-gāna* (thirty-second chapter, GOS edition). Abhinava has brought out the distinction between the *gāndharva* and *gāna* systems.

The fundamental distinction was that *gāndharva* was ritualistic music resulting in *adṛṣta-phala* or transcendental merit, whereas *dhruvā-gāna*, on the other hand, was music for the theatre, outside which it would not serve much purpose. Thus, Abhinava states—*na hi nāṭyādbahirlayabhaṅgayāpi dhruvāgānam gīyamanamukha ? (ṁ sukha)* pādamutpādayati.*"[1a] *Gāna* had a *dṛṣta-phala*, which was to produce *rasa*, thereby producing *rakti*, i.e. giving pleasure to the audience "*rāgamiti raktirdṛṣṭaphalam*",[1b] says Abhinava. Though *gāndharva* is the source of *gāna*, which draws all its essential elements

* As *Utpādayati* requires an object, an emendation is suggested in the bracket.

from the *former*, *tāla* from the *saptarūpa*, its melodic forms from the *jātis*, yet there is quite a difference between the two systems. This is because they are designed to serve different purposes. *Dhruvā* is a purposive transformation of the *gāndharva* to produce music for the theatre. Being free from rituals it is innovative and produces *rasa* and thus gives pleasure or *rañjana*. Abhinava says that from the *gītakas* which lay emphasis on *adṛṣṭa* certain elements are culled and synthesized so as to be able to please through *rasa* and *bhāva*. Thus, *dhruvā* as a transformation of elements drawn from *gāndharva* has the purpose of furthering the dramatic effect of *rasa* [1c] According to Bharata "*Dhruvā* is so called because the *varṇa*, *alaṅkāras*, *yati*, *pāṇi* and *laya* in it are hormoniously fixed."[2] Five types of *dhruvās* have been enumerated by Bharata viz. *prāveśikī*, *ākṣepikī*, *prāsādikī*, *antara* and *niṣkrāmikī*.[3] The *dhruvās* suggested acts and moods of different characters in a play; and this was suggested by the contents of the songs, as well as their metre, language, tempo and *tāla*. Particular kinds of *dhruvās* were to be rendered on particular junctures and occasions on stage. Themes of various *rasas* sung at the entrance of the characters on stage were termed *prāveśikī dhruvās*.[4] The exit of characters is indicated through *naiṣkrāmikī dhruvā*.[5] If there was a sudden disturbance in the prevailing *rasa (prastutam rasam, AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 313) of the scene by the imposition then a new element, the *ākṣepikī dhruvā*, was employed.[6] The prevailing sentiment or *rasa* which had been disturbed by sudden intervention (*ākṣeparasāt*, *NŚ*, 32. 314) is once again purified '*...prostutam rasaviśeṣam yādā prasādayati nirmalīkaroti*' *(AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 314) and stabilised *(ākṣepavaśāt sthirīkaraṇārthatvāditi, l.c.)* by *prāsādikī dhruvā*. It helps to restore the absorbed interest of the spectator, producing pleasure and hence was known as *prāsādikī (...sāmājikahṛdayam tanmayībhāvāpattiyogyātmano janānāmiti gītaśobhayā vā prasādayojanāḥ—l.c.)*. This was invariably after the *prāveśikī* and *ākṣepikī dhruvās*, says Abhinava (*iyam hi prāveśikyāk'ṣepikya antaramavasyaprayojyābhavati—AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 314). The *antara dhruvā* was sung to cover up a fault or mistake by the actor during the actual enacting of a play.[7] It seems that sometimes when the actor was disturbed due to exertion or some confusion and committed a mistake, then the *antara dhruvā* was sung to give time to the actor to regain his composure, adjust his costume etc.[8]

Abhinava has given us historical examples of the application of these *dhruvās* in various plays of the times. Abhinava mentions the play *Ratnāvalī* where the *prāveśikī dhruvā* has been used. Commenting on verse 10 of Ch. 32, he says, "In all *prāveśikīs*, *pravṛtta* and *upavṛtta* are to be used, says Bharata. The idea is that the tempo or

laya has to be matched with the flow of feelings. "In *Ratnāvalī*, Sāgarikā's mental state is full of eagerness and agitation because of imaginary meeting with her lover, and consequently it is a theme for quick movement or fast tempo *(cittadrutalaya)*."[9] In some cases, the entranc of characters was not to be accompanied by the *prāveśikī dhruvā*, for instance when the character entered singing, crying, in agitation, in a state of shock etc.[10] Abhinava gives the example of such a *dhruvāśūnya* entrance (entrance precluding the *prāveśikī dhruvā*) in the play *Nāgānanda*—"A case where there is entrance without *dhruvā*. Even in the case of the leading character, there is no *dhruvā*, when he is entering in a state of flurry and agitation. Just as Śaṁkhacūḍa in approaching *garuḍa* who is keen to eat Jīmūtavāhana."[11]

An example of the *ākṣepikī dhruvā* is illustrated by Abhinava from the play *Udāttarāghava*. Rāma is the hero and the scene is of *śṛṅgāra*. Suddenly. Rāvaṇa in a state of fury, enters the scene and angrily addresses Rāma. This change of the aesthetic mood from one of love to one of fury and anger is the juncture for the *ākṣepikī dhruvā* and here the tempo befitting the change is a fast one. Another example of the *ākṣepikī* is illustrated in the third Act of the play *Veṇīsāṁhāra*. The scene is of the *Mahābhārata* battle and an enthusiastic Aśvatthāman is eager to vanquish his enemies. Suddenly, the death of his father Droṇa is reported and the mood changes to one of pathos. In this change of *rasa* from *vīra* to *karuṇa* the *ākṣepikī dhruvā* is to be rendered with a slow tempo.[12] The *Kuṭṭinīmatam* of Dāmodaragupta (8th cent. A.D.) has an interesting reference of a contemporary performance of the first act of Harṣa's *Ratnāvalī*. After all the instruments had been properly timed, the performance began with the playing of the flute, and the *prāveśikī dhruvā* was rendered as a *dvipadā* in the *rāga Bhinnapañcama*.[12a] Then the *Sūtradhāra*, entering, danced round the stage to the accompaniment of a *dhruvā* set to the proper *tāla*. Next was the *prastāvanā*, the dialogue between the *Sūtradhāra* and his wife, the *naṭī*. Thereupon, the two made their exit by the *nihsasana gita* with the appropriate *dhruvā*, probably the *niṣkrāmikī*. At the conclusion of the act, the hero, king Udayana, and other characters made their exit also with the *niṣkrāmikī dhruvā*.[13] The *dhruvās* were set to musical forms such as *grāma rāgas, rāgas, bhāṣā, vibhāṣā* etc. Abhinava explains that these musical forms were derived from the melodic structures of *gāndharva*, i.e. the *jātis*. At the end of his commentary on chapter twenty-eight he quotes a verse in *āryā* from the *NŚ* (not available now)[14] to this purpose. He says, "some read the following *āryā* to indicate the possibility of the *grāma rāgas* being born from *jātis*. (Then he quotes the *āryā* verse the essence of which is thus):

"The sources of a *miśrageya* (mixed song form) are on the basis of the dominating form (i.e. to say mixed forms are attributed to *jātis* whose forms are most numerous in them). In these *saṁkara* or hydrid forms there is much intermingling due to a variety of ornamentation for the sake of enhancing the pleasing effect." "That which is mixed by being joined with the *lakṣaṇas* of the *jātyaṁśas*, that is *miśra* and *geya* means that which has the characteristics of *grāma-rāga* etc. Thus, if the *aṁśa*, related to some *jātyaṁśaka* is the *nyāsa* of another and the *apanyāsa* of still another, then there is much variety. That is, these *saṁkara* forms were conceived by bringing together the *aṁśa* of one *jāti* with the *nyāsa* of another or the *apanyāsa* of still another and thus numerous combinations were possible giving rise to a variety of *grāma-rāgas* etc. Thus *miśrageya* or mixed form i.e. *grāma rāgas*, thus arising from the *jātis* with much elaboration of form have been regulated by (theorists) like Mataṅga, Nandikāśyapa, Yaṣṭika etc. This is a mixed drink."[15] The mixed drink has been mentioned elsewhere too (chapter 32). Since *miśrageya* i.e., *grāma-rāgas* were born through combining various elements of various elements of various *jātis*, they were analogous to *pānaka* (a popular mixed drink of the period).[16] However, just as the *pānaka*, though made by a mixture of spices, had a flavour of its own. similarly the mixed forms, though born of *jātis* were new and independent musical forms, with characteristics peculiar to them and different from the forms they were derived from. However, the parent *jātis* could always be traced by discerning the *jāti* or *jātis* whose structure dominated the *rāga* form. Thus Abhinava quotes Dattila saying—"Dattilācārya also says, when there is *saṁkara* then the *jāti* is indicated by *rūpa-bāhulya* i.e. frequency of form. Thus *bhinna ṣaḍja* is similar to *ṣaḍjodīcyavatī* but different from *nandayantī* because the forms frequent in it are different from those in the latter."[17] Thereafter, to prove his point, Abhinava quotes a long passage from somewhere in which *grāma rāgas* etc. were traced to their parent *jātis*.[18] The Vṛttikāra of *Bṛhaddeśī* says that *grāma rāgas* are born of *jātis*[19] and he ascribes this statement to Bharata. *Bhāṣā*, *vibhāṣā* and such forms were born from *grāma rāgas* and not directly of *jātis*. Thus we find in the *Bṛhaddeśī*—"*bhāṣās* are born of *grāma rāgas*, *vibhāṣikās* are born of *bhāṣās* and from the *vibhāṣās* have sprung up the *antarabhāṣikās*."[20] Kallinātha explaining the name *uparāga* says that they are so named since they are close to *grāma rāgas* born of *jātis*.[21] He quotes Mataṅga who questions the relevance of relating *rāgas* to particular *grāmas*. Kallinātha answers by quoting Bharata's view that (this is because) *grāma rāgas* are born of *jātis*.[22] In the context of explaining the significance of the term *grāma* of the word *grāma-raga*,

he says that though *grāma-rāgas* are not born of *grāmas* but of *jātis*, yet compared to forms such as *bhāṣās*, *rāgas* etc. they are less removed from *grāmas*; hence the name *grāma-rāgas*.[23] Abhinava, too, says "*grāma rāgas*—because *grāma* means a collection of *jātis (jāti-samūha)* and connected with that are the excellences of entertainment and *raktātiśaya*."[24] Abhinava includes *grāma-rāgas* in the forms that were *gāndharvakalpa* (close to *gāndharva*). Bharata had stated that the note *madhyama* was never to be omitted in *sāman* singing as also in the forms which he terms '*gāndharva-kalpa*'[25] Abhinava comments thus: "For the sake of variety when the *rāgas* are performed as *grāma-rāgas*. six notes can be dropped (it may be noted that Abhinava says six and not seven) by the technique of *ṣāḍava* and *auḍava* using one's intelligence in the *jātis* (notes can be dropped). But *madhyama* is never to be omitted, almost as in *gāndharva* thus. This refers to *gāndharva-śāstra* or even the forms where the extent of *gāndharva* is not wholly finished as in the form of *grāma-rāga*. By this the dispensability of *madhyama* in *bhāṣā*, *deśī*, *mārga* etc., is understood."[26]

In fact, in the *Vṛtti* of the *Bṛhaddeśī* is quoted a passage of Kāśyapa which ascribes to the *grāma-rāgas* the same ten *lakṣaṇas* which characterise the *jātis* namely, *aṁśa*, *nyāsa*, *ṣaḍava*, *auḍava*, *alpatva*, *bahutva*, *graha*, *apanyāsa*. *mandra*, *tāra*.[27] Yet, however close to the *jātis*, the *grāma-rāgas* did not belong to the *gāndharva* system but to the popular, freer system of music termed *gāna*; their ultimate purpose was not *adṛṣṭa* or transcendental merit (as in *gāndharva*) but to impart pleasure to the audience. *Grāma-rāgas* were classified into different categories according to their style of rendering. This was termed *gīti*, and thus different *grāma-rāgas* were classified into different *gītis* The word *gīti* has been discussed before, but not as pertaining to *gāndharva*. There were four *gītis* in *gāndharva* viz. *māgadhī*, *ardha-māgadhī*, *sambhāvitā* and *pṛthulā*, which depended upon certain patterns of syllabic formations. Thus *gīti* in *gāndharva* depended upon *pada*. Bharata decrees that these *gītis* were to be used only in *gāndharva* and prohibits their use in *dhruvā gāna*.[28] The singing of the above mentioned four *gītis* led to the distortion of *pada*. In the *dhruvās*, the *pada* was the most important factor since the meaning of the song was brought out only by clear and proper rendering of the *pada* or words. The *gītis* in *dhruvā* were dependent on *svara*. Pointing out the differences between the two *gītis* Kallinātha says, "Indeed what is the difference between the *gītis* such as *māgadhī* etc., spoken of earlier, and that of *gītis* such as *śuddhā* etc." He answers—"*māgadhī* etc., primarily depend upon *pada* and *tāla* whereas *śuddhā* etc., are chiefly dependent upon *svara*."[29] Hence the prohibition is quite logical. Bharata

does not mention any other sort of *gīti* besides these four. Kallinātha too states that Bharata had mentioned only four *gītis* in *dhruvā*, namely *māgadhī* etc.[30] It is possible that the idea of classifying *grāma-rāgas* according to different *gītis* in *dhruvā* may have evolved in the course of time (the rendering of *grāma-rāgas* in different styles may of course have been prevalent but perhaps not categorised as such). This is borne out the fact that the three *dhruvā gītis* postulated by early theorists like *Yāṣṭika* were *bhāṣā*, *vibhāṣā* and *antarabhāṣā*; and that by Śārdūla only one, that being *bhāṣā*.[31] Now, Kallinātha quoting Mataṅga says that *bhāṣā* stands only for a particular manner or fashion of rendering *ālāpa* of *grāma rāgas*. The word *bhāṣā* here denotes 'mode' or 'manner'. In the same way the words '*vibhāṣā*' and *antarabhāṣā*, too denote *ālāpa prakāra* only.[32] This seems to explains how *bhāṣā*, *vibhāṣā* etc., sprang up from *grāma-rāgas, gauḍī, vesara, sādhāraṇa, bhāṣā*, and *vibhāṣā*.[33] The first five seem to have been accepted as standard by later theorists like Śārṅgadeva, with the difference that the fourth *gīti* namely *rāgagīti* was known as *vesara*. *Bhāṣā*, *vibhāṣā* and *antarabhāṣā* seem to have acquired the status of independent melodic forms and were distinct from the *gītis*. Kallinātha, commenting on the five *gītis* of Śārṅgadeva says : 'There (he) divides the *grāmarāgas* 'five types' thus. *Grāmarāgas* are of five types. By what particular fashion have they been categorised into five types? Thus (he) says, 'by way of five *gītis*'. 'What are those five *gītis*', anticipating this (question) he says, '*gītis*' are five thus, *śuddhā*, *bhinnā*, *gauḍī vesara* and *sādhāraṇa*, these are the five *gītis*.[34] Śārṅgadeva has given characteristics of these five *gītis*. In the *śuddhā* style, the melody was rendered in a clear and simple style without any complexities, and was gentle and soft. The *bhinnā* style was a complex one, with subtle notes and *gamakas*.[35] The *gauḍī* style was characterised by the use of sharp *gamakas* pervading all the three octaves. It was beautified by the use of *ohati* or *lalita svaras*. This meant the use of trembling notes in the lower octave, rendered in fast speed, as also the use of '*hakāra*'.[36] *Vesara* or *rāgagīti* was characterised by a brisk and fast style,[37] and the *sādhāraṇī* was dependent upon the above four styles, i.e., was a mixture of all four.[38]

Abhinava, at the end of chapter twenty-eight, quotes a long passage of Kaśyapa.[39] Here, thirty-three *grāma-rāgas* are classified into five *gītis* viz. *śuddhā bhinnā*, *gauḍī*, *vesara* and *sādhāraṇī*. *Vibhāṣā* is mentioned as a sixth *gīti*, but no *grāma-rāga* is given with it. Thereafter, the last line says, here are seven *gītis* to be used in *dhruvā gāna*. The seventh *gīti* is not mentioned; probably *bhāṣā* is the one meant. However, a critical analysis of the passage shows that the author believed essentially in five basic aforementioned *gītis*; the sixth, *vibhāṣā* is

	Grāma rāga	*Gīti*	*Source jāti*	*Aṁśa*	*Nyāsa*	*Weak or Omitted Notes*	*Saṅgītaratnākara/Bṛ.*
1.	Ṣaḍjagrāma	Śuddha	Ṣāḍjī, madhyamā[40]		ma		Śārṅgadeva gives *sa* as *graha*, *aṁśa* and *apanyāsa*, *vīra rasa* sung during monsoons ṣaḍjādi *mūrcchanā* used in *pratimukha sandhi*.[41]
2.	Madhyamagrāma	,,	madhyamodīcya[42]		ma		Śārṅgadeva gives *sa aṁśa*, used in *hāsya* and *śṛṅgāra rasas*, sung in summer season. *Sauvīra mūrcchanā nirvahaṇa sandhi*.[43]
3.	Śuddhaṣāḍava	,,	madhyamā	ma	ma	ga[43a]	Ample use in *pūrvaraṅga*.[43b]
4.	Pañcama	,,	madhyamā, pañcamī	pa	pa	ga, ni[43c]	The *Vṛtti* on *Bṛ*.[43d] gives, *Ṣaḍjodīyavatī*, *sa* as *aṁśa ma* as *nyāsa*.
5.	Kaiśikamadhyamā	,,	Kaiśikī Ṣaḍjamadhyamā[44]	sa	ma	ga weak ri, pa omitted[45]	*Vīra*, *adbhuta*, *raudra rasas*, used in *nirvahaṇa sandhi*.[46]
6.	Sādhārita	,,	Ṣaḍjamadhyamā	sa	ma	ga, ni weak	*Ṣaḍjādi* (*mūrcchanā* of *ṣaḍjagrāma vīra*, *raudra rasas*. Sung or played on the occasion of *garbha sandhi*.[47]
7.	Kaiśika	,,	Kaiśikī Kārmaravī	sa	pa	pūrṇa	*Ṣaḍjādi mūrcchanā* (of *madhyama grāma*); *vīra*, *raudra*, *adbhuta rasas*; sung invariably

							in winter season. Used in *nirvahaṇa sandhi.*[48]
1.	Bhinnaṣaḍja	Bhinna	Ṣaḍjodicyavā	dha	ma	pa, ri	*uttarāyatā mūrcchanā*; *bībhatsa, bhayānaka rasas*; used in *prāveśikī gāna.*[49]
2.	Bhinnatāna[50]	,,	Pañcamī madhyama	pa	ma	ri	Subtle, complex notes[51] *karuṇa rasa.*[51a]
3.	Kaiśikamadhyama	,,	Ṣaḍjamadhya	sa	ma	ga, ni	*Ṣaḍjādi mūrcchanā* (of *ṣadja grāma*). *Vīra, raudra, adbhuta rasas.*[52]
4.	Bhinnapañcama	,,	madhyama, pañcamī	dha	pa	ri	*Pauravī mūrcchanā; bhayānaka bībhatsa*; sung during the entrance of the *Sūtradhāra*, summer.[53] Complex use of *pañcama svara.*[53a]
5.	Bhinnakaiśika	,,	Kārmaravī Kaiśikī[54]	sa	pa		*Sampūrṇa; ṣaḍjādi mūrcchanā (madhyama grāma), vīra, raudra, adbhuta*, winter season.[55]
1.	Gauḍapañcama	Gauḍa	Dhaivatī Ṣaḍjamadhyā	dha	ma	pa	*dhaivatādi mūrcchanā* of *ṣaḍja grāma; bhayānaka, bībhatsa vipralambha rasas*, summer season.[56]
2.	Kaiśikamadhyā	,,	Ṣaḍjamadhyama[56a]	sa	ma		*Ṣaḍjādi mūrcchanā* (of *ṣaḍja-grāma*) *bhayānaka vīra, pūrṇa.*[51]

	Grāma rāga	*Gīti*	*Source jāti*	*Aṁśa*	*Nyasa*	*Weak or Omitted Notes*	*Saṅgītaratnākara/Bṛ.*
3.	Kaiśika	Gauḍa	Kaiśikī Ṣaḍjamadhyā[58]	sa	pa		*Ṣaḍjādi mūrcchanā*; pūrṇa; *karuṇa, vīra, raudra, adbhuta*.[59]
1.	Sauvīra	Vesara	Ṣaḍjamadhyā	sa	sa	ga, ni	*Ṣaḍja* as *graha, nyāsa, aṁśa*; *ṣaḍjadi mūrcchanā* (of ṣaḍja-grāma); used in the entrance of ascetics, house-holders etc. *Śānta rasa*, pūrṇa.[60]
2.	Ṭakka	,,	Dhaivatī Ṣaḍjamadhyā[60a]	sa	sa	pa	'*ādya mūrcchanā* (of *ṣaḍja-grāma*); weak *pañcama; vīra rasa*, particularly for rainy season, pūrṇa.[61]
3.	Mālava vesara[62]	,,	Pañcamī Madhyama?	ma?	ma?	ga, ni	
4.	Vesaraṣāḍava	,,	Ṣaḍja madhyama	ma	ma	ga, ni	*Madhyamādi mūrcchanā* (of the *ṣaḍja grāma*); sampūrṇa; śānta, śṛṅgāra, *hāsya*.[63]
5.	Boṭṭa[64]	,,	Pañcamī Ṣaḍjamadhyamā	pa	ma	ga, ni	*Pañcamādi mūrcchanā* (of *madhyama grāma*); *hāsya, śṛṅgāra*; sung during festivals.[65]
6.	Hiṇḍolaka	,,	Dhaivatī Ārṣabhī[66]	sa	sa		*Śuddha madhya mūrcchanā ri, dha*, omitted; *vīra, raudra, adbhuta rasas sambhoga* (śṛṅgāra) too; spring season.[67]

7.	Ṭakkakaiśika	Vesara	Madhyamā Dhaivatī[68]	dha	dha	ga, ni	*uttarāyatā mūrcchanā*; *bhayānaka*, *bībhatsa rasas*; used at the entrance of the *kañcukī*.[69]
8.	Mālavakaiśika	,,	Kaiśikī	sa	sa	dha	*Ṣaḍjādi mūrcchanā*; *vīra raudra*, *adbhuta rasas*, *vipralambha śṛṅgāra*; *śṛṅgāra*; winter season.[70]
1.	Bhammana pañcama	Sādhāraṇī	Ṣaḍjamadhya[71]	sa	ma	ga, ni	*Ṣaḍjādi mūrcchanā*; *vīra*, *raudra*, *adbhuta rasas*; to enact loosing one's way or being lost in the forest.[72]
2.	Rūpasādhāra	,,	Ṣaḍjamadhyama,	sa	ma	ri, pa	*pūrṇa*; *ṣaḍjādi mūrcchanā* (of *ṣaḍja grāma*); *vīra* (*karuṇa*), *raudra*, *adbhuta*.[73]
3.	Gandhāra pañcama	,,	Gāndhārī Raktagāndhārī[74]	ga	ga	ri[75]	*hariṇasya mūrcchanā*; *pūrṇa*, *adbhuta*, *hāsya*, *karuṇa*.[76]
4.	Revagupta	,,	Ārṣabhī[77]	ri	ma	sa[78]	Sampūrṇa *vīra*, *raudra*, *adbhuta rasas*; used in *udbhaṭa cārīs* and *maṇḍalas*.[79]
5.	Ṣaḍajakaiśika	,,	Kaiśiki	sa	ni, ga[79a]	ri[79b]	*Ṣaḍjādi mūrcchanā*; *vīra*, *raudra*. *adbhuta*.[80]
6.	Śakapañcama	,,	Ṣaḍji Dhaivatī[81]	sa	sa	ni, ga, pa[81a]	*Ṣaḍji mūrcchanā* (*ṣaḍjagrāma*); *pūrṇa*, *vīra*, *hāsya*, *nirvahaṇa sandhi*.[82]

mentioned casually in just one line, and the seventh is not even mentioned. Abhınava describes seven *grāma-rāgas* of the *śūddhā gīti*, five belonging to the *bhinnā gīti*, three of *gauḍī gīti*, eight of the *vesara* and nine of the *sādhāraṇī gīti*. Śārṅgadeva too has classified the very same 7, 5, 3 and 8 *grāma-rāgas* into *śuddhā*. *bhinnā*, *gauḍī* and *vesara*, respectively. However, for the *sādhāraṇī gīti* Śārṅgadeva mentions only 7 *rāgas*, whereas Abhinava gives the number as nine. Since the text giving the names of the *grāma-rāgas* belonging to the *sādhāraṇī gītis* missıng at places it is a little difficult to get the name of all the nine *grāma rāgas*. Notwithstanding this difficulty a chart has been made (pp. 234-37) to represent these *grāma rāgas* (in the passage quoted by Abhinava) according to their respective *gītis*. The name of three *grāma rāgas* of the *sādhāraṇī gīti* are missing. Two of these might be the *grāma-rāgas*, *narta* and *kakubha*, mentioned by Mataṅga and *Śārṅgadeva* as belonging to the *sādhāraṇī gīti*.[83]

Bharata associates six *grāma-rāgas* (though he does not mention the term *grāma-rāga*) with the *pūrvaraṅga* and with the five *sandhis* or the important junctures of the plot. The *śuddha* or pure variety of *ṣāḍava* was to be rendered during *pūrvaraṅga—Pūrvaraṅgavidhāne tu kartavyo rāgajo vidhiḥ*,[84] says Bharata. The word '*rāgajo*' does not communicate much meaning, hence the varient reading '*ṣāḍava*' should be accepted. Abhinava too, prescribes '*cokṣaṣāḍava*' (i.e., pure or *śuddha ṣāḍava*) to be used in the *pūrvaraṅga—pūrvaraṇgovidhāne tu kuryādvaicokṣaṣāḍavam*.[85] Elsewhere, he quotes a verse of Mātṛgupta, which says that *caukṣaṣāḍava* is sung in the beginning for auspiciousness *(māṅgalyārtham)*.[86] The *Vṛtti* on *Bṛhaddeśī* states that *śuddhaṣāḍava* is the chief amongst the six *rāgas*, since there is ample use of it in the *pūrvaraṅga*.[87] At the *sandhis* or junctures termed *mukha* and *pratimukha grāma-rāgas*, named *madhyamagrāma* and *ṣaḍjagrāma* respectively, are to be used. *Sādhāritā* was used in the *garbha sandhi*, *pañcama* in the *vimarśa* or *avamarśa* and *kaiśika* in the *nirvahaṇa sandhi—mukhe tu madhyamagrāmaḥ ṣaḍjaḥ pratimukhe bhavet sādhāritastathā garbha vi (sva) marśe caiva pañcamam kaiśikam ca tathā kāryam gānam nirvahaṇe budhaih*.[88]

It has been noted that both the *Vṛtti*[89] on *Bṛhaddeśī* and Kāllinātha[90] quote this passage of Bharata, but with varient readings from the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. At yet another place, Kallinātha quotes this passage with two additional lines in the beginning, which state that *śuddhā gīti* is used in the *pūrvaraṅga*, *bhinnā* during the *prastāvanā*, *vesara* during *mukha* and *pratimukha*, *gauḍī* during the *garbha*, and *sādhāritā* durıng the *avamarśa sandhis*.[91] The *Vṛtti* on *Bṛhaddeśī* quotes Kaśyapa saying that the *grāma-rāgas* should be used in drama in accordance with pres-

cription; *gāna* which is of five types—*praveśa, ākṣepa, niṣkrama, prāsādika* and *antara*—should be sung to these *rāgas*. During the *pūrvaraṅga*, the *grāma-rāgas* of the *śuddhagīti* are used, the *bhinnā* during *prastāvanā*, the *vesara* during the two *mukhas*, the *gauḍa* during the *avamarśa sandhi* as also the *nirvahaṇa*.[92] Thus Bharata does mention *grāma-rāgas* (though he does not use this term) used in the various *sandhis* of drama. It seems that *bhāṣās*, too, were current during Bharata's time—*Saindhavīmāśritām bhāṣām jñeyam saindhavakam budhaiḥ*.[93]

In his commentary on the thirty-third chapter Abhinava distinguishes between *gāndharva* and *gāna* systems, thereby imparting information about the structure and nature of *gāna*. The two systems were distinct in respect of all three musical elements viz. *svara*, *pada* and *tāla*. Thus says Abhinava, "In *gāna*, diverse *śrutis* are used because of the use of *kākalī* and *antara śruti*. Notes in the *mālava kaiśika* are seen to belong to the *catuśśrutika aṅga* and there is so much diversity of notes and of the *śrutis* belonging to the *rāga*, *bhāṣā*, *deśī* and *mārga* etc. that it cannot be described. Their experience creates a sense of strange variation. And even when experienced, those who do not know the *lakṣaṇas* will feel them only like children, in a dumb fashion. What is more, the rule of the interval (i.e. *śruti interval-antarāla niyama*) must be adhered to in *gāndharva* on account of the internal *pramāṇa*, *sthāna*, *svara*, *kalā* and *aṁśa*. But that is not so in *gāna*."[94] In *gāndharva* only the fundamental seven notes were used and the *kākalī* and *antara* notes must have entailed the use of other *sādhāraṇa* notes like *ṣaḍja sādhāraṇa* and *madhyama sādhāraṇa*, *catuśśrutika dhaivata*, *triśrutika pañcama* etc. In fact, from Abhinava's passage it seems that the rule of a fixed *śruti* interval between two notes, an absolute must in *gāndharva*, could be disregarded in *gāna*. At another place Abhinava says, "By this, it is shown that the peculiarity and strangeness of notes owing to higher and lower pitch have been regulated in gāndharva for transcendental purposes (*adṛṣṭasiddhyai*) or, for empirical purposes (*dṛṣṭa-siddhi*) the one-*śruti* character of notes has been demonstrated. But strange peculiarities are plainly seen in the *lakṣya* music of *rāga*, *bhāṣā*, etc. Thus venerable Kāśyapa says, "In the *rāgas*, *bhāṣās* one may use in all ways all the note of 4, 3, 2 or 1 *śruti*."[95] Even one-*śruti* notes were permissible in *gāna* ! This was an impossibility in *gāndharva*. It seems that any melodious *śruti* could be utilised in *gāna*. Discussing the use of notes in different melodic forms in *gāna* Abhinava says, "In *naṭakaiśika*, *lāta*, *nāgara* etc., *ṛṣabha* and *gāndharva* are not seen much and the notes are sung in diverse forms through the influence of more than forty-seven *jātyaṁśakas*. In the singing of *gāndharva* and *gāna* (*gāndharva* here appears to be an error)

notes are used which are beautiful and appropriate to the eight kinds of *gitis* namely, *śuddha, bhinnā, gauḍarāga (vesara), sādhāraṇa, bhāṣā, vibhāṣā* and *antarabhāṣā*.[96] Apparently in different styles of singing notes do not remain exactly the same and acquire different shades. In the *bhinnā giti*, *pañcama* sounded in a varied manner in the *bhinnapañcama* and *bhinnatāna grāmarāgas*. In chapter twenty-nine, Abhinava says that, "In reality these are forty-seven notes. But in brief, there are only three notes *udātta, anudātta* and *svarita*. However if one wishes to expound in detail, then the notes are infinite because of the diversity of *jātyaṁśaka, grāma rāga, bhāṣā, deśi* and *mārga*. Others say that just as a person may acquire different offices such as *aśvapati, mahāmātra, senāpati* or *purohita*, similarly the same *aṁśa svara* by its different positions and associations acquires a diversity of forms. For example, though *ṣaḍja* has the same *śrutis* in *mālava kaiśika* as in *Ṭakkarāga* it appears different in both. Again, it appears different in *vegasvara* and *saindhava*."[97]

Thus, in *gāndharva* the maximum permissible notes were nine—the seven primary notes and the sparingly used *antara* and *kākalī* notes. *Jātis*, however, could be rendered hexatonic and pentatonic by the dropping of one or two notes. But even this was done according to prescribed rules and notes could not be dropped just at will. In general, *dhaivata* could not be dropped of *ṣaḍja grāma jātis* and *pañcama* of *madhyama grāma* ones; *madhyama* was an indispensable note irrespective of the *grāma*. Moreover, the *aṁśa* note could not be omitted nor also the *saṁvādī* or the *vādī* note. *Gāna* was governed by no such rules. To create a pleasing effect any note could be dropped. Thus says Abhinava, "In *gāndharva*, the (rules governing) *lopa* are regulated according to the difference of the two *grāmas, jāti*, and *aṁśa*. But in *gāna* one proceeds according to *rakti* and there is no fixed rule."[98] In *gāndharva*, the dropping of more than two notes was not permissible since the octave had to have a minimum of at least five notes. "In *gāna*, any note could be dropped irrespective of the *grāma* and irrespective of its being either the *aṁśa, vādī* or *saṁvādī*. The dropping of even three notes was not unknown in *gāna*, since the *avakṛṣṭā dhruvā* is characterised by a four note formation", states Bharata.[99] Abhinava elucidates thus : "(Hexatonic and pentatonic octaves) this rule is observed in *gāndharva*. In *dhruvāgāna*, employed in dramatic performance a four-*svara* octave is also used. The *avkṛṣṭā dhruvā* is used in *karuṇa (rasa)* scenes and has prolific long syllables."[100]

Similarly, as regards the octaves all three—*mandra, madhya* and *tāra* were known to *gāndharva*, but the movement has to be according to prescribed rules; in the actual rendering of *jātis* the movement in

the *tāra* and *mandra* octaves was rather restricted (*NŚ*, 28. 70-71). In *gāna*, there was free movement in all three octaves as Abhinava comments that these restrictive rules did not apply to *gāna—iheti jātisu grāmarāgādau nāyam niyamaiti vibhāvaḥ*. (*AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 70).

Mūrcchanās and *tānas* have been discussed while dealing with the various elements of *gāndharva* music. Seven note *mūrcchanās* on being rendered hexatonic or pentatonic were termed *tānas*. However, here too, there were rules regarding the dropping of a note or pair of notes in either *grāma* and as a result there were only eighty-four hextatonic and pentatonic *tānas* permissible in *gāndharva*. In *gāna*, the *tānas* were limited by no such restrictions. Beside *tānas*, *gāna* utilised *kūṭatānas*, which were basically permutations of two or more notes in all possible disarray. Abhinava says "... in *gāndharva* there are fourteen *mūrcchanās* and eighty-four *tānas*. In *gāna*, there is a variety of *kūṭatānas* depending on the utilization of (as few as) two notes up to all the (seven) notes. Thus there would be 2, 6, 24, 720 and 5040." The seven notes of an octave could be permuted and combined in 5040 possible ways—two notes gave rise to only 2 combinations, three notes gave 6 combinations, four notes 24, five notes 120 and six notes 720 combinations. Permutations and combinations of all the seven notes with each other gave rise to 5040 possible combinations.[101] All these possible combinations were permissible in *gāna*. Bharata has not described *kūṭatānas*. However, Dattila[102] says that *kūṭatāna* was a *mūrcchanā*, but with this basic difference that unlike the *mūrcchanā* its note sequence was in disarray. A *kūṭatāna* when rendered with all the seven notes was called *pūrṇa kūṭatāna*, when rendered with less than seven, i.e. with hexatonic or pentatonic structure, it was termed *apūrṇa kūṭatāna*. The latter could be rendered with four notes or less. Dattila gives the number of *kūṭatānas* as 5033. These *kūṭatānas* pertained only to *gāna* and it is only in the context of *rāgas* that Abhinava discusses them. "There is proper cultivation of the *grāma-rāgas*, *bhāṣās* etc., when the notes of the *mūrcchanā* are rendered with ease in a successive or non-successive order (i.e. *kūṭatāna*) order. In each *grāma-rāga* etc., all the *mūrcchanās* and *kūṭatānas* may be used in many and diverse ways. It follows that there is no limitation."[103] Differentiating between the regular and fixed *tānas* of the *gāndharva* style and the numerous variety of the *tānas* in *dhruvā gāna*, Abhinava says that although in the *jātis*, there are only fixed and regulated hexatonic and pentatonic (*tānas*), in *rāga* and *bhāsā*, a wondrous variety is established (the word '*unmūlayitum*' meaning 'uprooted' is evidently a mistake here), which is pleasing to the ear.[104] We know that the fundamental difference between *gāndharva* and *gāna* lay in their ultimate purpose—that

of *gāndharva* was *adṛṣṭa* or transcendental merit, while *gāna* had the *dṛṣṭa* purpose of *rakti* or pleasure. On this basis, Abhinava distinguishes *kūṭatānas* from the 84 regular *tānas* of the *gāndharva* system. He says : "As to the objection why are the *kūṭatānas* not mentioned, the fact of being *kūṭa*, i.e., being in *irregular* order is not in itself of any importance. They have the general characteristic of giving pleasure. Only by rule of the enumerated eighty-four (i.e. the regular 84 *tānas* of *gāndharva*) have the fixed function of pleasing particalar *devatās*. They may not thus (i.e. for pleasing the *devatās*) be used (referring here to *kūṭatānas*). In a general way, there use is obvious. As to why they have not been counted, the answer is, how are they to be counted when they are infinite?"[105] Here, Abhinava clearly refers to the eighty-four regular *tānas* of the *gāndharva*, which pleased the gods and brought about *adṛṣṭa*. Referring to the *kūṭatānas* (which have no fixed number and being numerous are termed by Abhinava as 'infinite') he says that they should not be thus used, i.e. for pleasing gods. If not for *adṛṣṭa*, what then, is their use ? This is exactly the question which Abhinava raises and answers too. "Then what is their purpose? No, when the performer is proper even that produces pleasure for the audience."[106] That is, when properly performed they have the *dṛṣṭa* purpose of *rakti* or pleasure.

The *dhruvā tāla* had its source in *gāndharva*, but even though born from it, it was distinct—a purposive transformation of the *saptarūpa*. *Dhruvā* was the name given to a form compounded out of various minor *gāndharva* forms, as also the major *saptarūpas*. These all stood for certain *tāla* structures. Out of them selective elements were combined into the *dhruvā*. Basically the *dhruvā* drew its constituents from the *gītāṅgas*, the *saptarūpa*, *saptarūpa pramāṇa* (the measure of *saptarūpa* such as *tryasra* and *caturasra* measures) minor forms such as *ṛk*, *gāthās*, *pāṇikā* etc.[107] From the *gītakas*, which lay emphasis on the *adṛṣṭa*, certain elements are culled and synthesized, so as to be able to please through *rasa* and *bhāva*. Thus *dhruvā* as a transformation of elements drawn from *gāndharva* has the purpose of strengthening the dramatic effect of *rasa*.[108] *Tāla* in *dhruvā gāna* was a flexible and varied one. *Tāla* (as also *svara*) in *dhruvā* was subservient to *pada* and helped to highlight the words of the *dhruvā*. In accompaniment to the words, it was agitated, slow, staccato, sombre ete., and thus helped heighten the desired aesthetic mood created by the poetry of the *dhruvā* song. Not only did *tāla* expressively accompany *dhruvās* but it also served various *dramatic* functions effectively. The *dramatis personae* moved with characteristic, stylised *gaits* which behoved their differring social status (*uttama*, *madhyama* and *adhama*) and in accordance

with their distinct dramatic functions. These movements were accompanied by suitable sounds on the percussion.[109]

Tāla in *gāndharva* was played on *ghana* or idiophonic instruments, which consisted of cymbals, generally of bronze.[110] Abhinava says : "*ghana* is so called because of the hardness of its form. Due to this hardness, *ghana* instruments cannot play specific *varṇas* expressive of different *rasas* or *bhāvas*. *Tāla* (or *ghana*) is only used for establishing *śamyā*."[111] *Śamyā* indicated neutral 'balance' or 'equipoise' between *tāla* and *svara* structures. Again, he says : "*ghana vādya* can produce only a single monotonous sound, unvaried in nature and is used only to keep the measure in a *tāla* by sounding at right intervals."[112] It could not be used for expressive playing as in *avanaddha* instruments. *Tāla* in *dhruvā gāna* was played on *avanaddha* instruments. These membranophonic drums were capable of expressing a wide variety of *varṇas* or '*bols*'. These drums, through the pliancy and resulting inflections of the taut skin on which they are played, produce a number of notes at different pitches as well as a wide variety of different expressive sounds.[113]

The *dhruvā* lyrics had an inherent rhythm of their own, as they were set to various poetic metres.[114] The *dhruvā* form was structured by the metric (*guru-laghu* syallables) or prosodic unit of the lyric. In *dhruvā* the metre appropriate to that *rasa* and *bhāva* was primary. As far as *gāndharva* music was concerned it did not restrict the musical time form by consideration of syllables etc.[115] While in *gāndharva* the standard time unit was the *kalā*, consisting of five *laghus*, in *dhruvā* the basic tune unit comprised of only one *laghu* (i.e. the smallest metric unit). Thus, *tāla* in *gāna* was much faster than the slow, sombre one of *gāndharva*. Abhinava emphasizes the fact that the metres used must be in harmony with the *rasa* and *bhāva*. "In *dhruvās* because of the primacy of qualities like *rasa*, etc., the metres sung should be in concordance with the meaning (of the song). Just as in the movement of a chariot, the *pātas* or sounded beats are of *druta gati* or fast movement, and the *varṇas* and *varṇāṅgas* are accordingly, in *karuṇa rasa* there are *guru* and *pluta pātas* and appropriate *varṇāṅgas*."[116] Unsounded beats, viz. *avāpa*, *vikṣepa*, *niṣkrama* and *praveśa* had basically a ritualistic purpose and thus were appropriate to *gāndharva*. For the theatre, however, they were irrelevant and hence not used in *dhruvā gāna*.

As regards *pada*, it was the primary element in *gāna*, *svara* and *tāla* being subservient to it. Thus Abhinava says, "In *gāndharva*, *svara* and *tāla* are primary. *Pada* is used only as a basis or support for the other two. In the *dhruvā*, on the other hand, words and meanings are

primary.[117] Again, Abhinava says : "Thus, in *gāndharva*, *svara* is predominant, *pada* is secondary and (acts) as a prop. In contrast, in *gāna*, *pada* is primary as it expresses the meaning (of the song) and *svara* is secondary as (its role is) only to beautify the *pada*."[118]

Since words and meanings were important in *dhruvā*, the *pada* had to be clearly enunciated and was not to be distorted in singing as in *gāndharva*.[119] Thus, *varṇa prakarṣa* or stretching of the words to suit the melody was not desirable—the melody was to adapt itself so as to highlight the *pada*. For this very reason the use of such *alaṁkāras* which led to *varṇa prakarṣa* was not practised in *dhruvā gāna*. Thus Bharata states : *Saptarūpagatā jñeyā alaṁkārā budhaistme naite (sarve) dhruvāsviṣṭāḥ śruti (srotri) varṇaprakarṣāt na hi varṇaprakaraṣastu dhruvānām siddhiriṣyate/ śyeno vāpyathavā bindurye cānye'ti (tu) prakarṣiṇaḥ//*[120] Abhinava comments thus : "In *dhruvās* these *varṇas* are not desirable which involve lengthening or elaboration. Where many *alaṁkāras* are displayed on one syllable, that (too) is not desirable. Example of such *(prakarṣi)* elaborating *alaṁkāras* are *śyena* or *bindu*. These are only examples. There can be others."[121] The *gāndharva gītis* viz. *Māgadhī*, *Ardhamāgadhī*, *Sambhāvita* and *Pṛthula* were various styles of rendering which involved the splitting of words according to different *layas* or tempos. Hence these *gītis* were prohibited in *dhruvā* by Bharata—

etāstā gītayo jñeyā dhruvāyogam vinaivahi/
gāndharva eva yojyāstu nityam gānaprayoktṛbhiḥ//[122]

In *gāndharva*, both *nibaddha* and *anibaddha padas* were used i.e. songs with both meaningful and meaningless words were used. Thus in the *śuṣka gīta* meaningless words and syllables like '*diṅgle*', '*jhaṇtum*' etc. were used. This was because such songs had a ritualistic purpose and were not meant for dramatic purposes or pleasing the audience. Such songs without meaning would be quite out of place in the theatrical context—*satālam ca dhruvā'rtheṣu nibaddhaṁ sarvasādhakam. NŚ*, 32.20. Commenting on this, Abhinava says "In *gāndharva*, *nibaddha* and *anibaddha padas* constituted by syllables are used. In *gāna*, however, *pada* is used with *tāla* and with a proper harmony and meaning appropriate to *rasa*. Hence, *pada* in *dhruvā* is not for the sake of *adṛṣṭa* as in *gāndharva*, nor does it depend on scriptures or tradition for pleasing the gods. In *gāna*, *pada* is primarily for the audience and hence intelligible to them."[123] However, Abhinava raises an objection, but also gives the answer to it—"Objection. Even in drama we come across the use of *svarālāpa* etc., without words and through the use of *huṁkāra* etc. Thus, in *dhruvā gāna* too, we come across singing which seems to be independent of the use of *varṇa*, *alaṁkāra* etc., in relation

to *rasa* and without *tāla* measured by *tryasra* etc. The answer is that such singing is in order to heighten the effect of the instruments like *viṇā* etc., and as a complement to the *dhruvā* which is going to be sung. It is a kind of filler *(pūraka)*, something that completes the effect of the instruments."[124]

From an interesting remark of Abhinava, we come to know that the female singers outnumbered the male singers. Abhinava says that this is because women are naturally given to fine arts like music, whereas men have to be taught.[125]

Abhinava also makes another interesting remark wherein he says that alongwith a sweet voice and a proficient hand in *tāla*, the songstress should also have the qualities of youth and a beautiful form and figure. The latter qualities however do not pertain to *gāndharva* musicians.[126] The reason is obvious—the context of singing was different, the former was for entertainment, whereas the latter was for transcendental merit.

Thus, it can be seen that though derivative of *gāndharva*, the *gāna* system of music had a uniqueness of its own and was distinct from *gāndharva* in both its nature and purpose.

Footnotes

1 *Gāndharvasaṁkṛtānāradādyā (Nāradīyaśikṣā*, 1.2); *gānayogam (ga) cikīrṣvastasya gāndharvaprakṛtitvena vyavasthāpayanto bhogopayoginamuktapūrvasaṁhāgtaṁ nāyamasmābhiḥ svamanīṣikārkṛtaḥ kiṁtu prakṛtāvapi na dṛṣṭa ityāgamaprāmāṇyenopodbalayannā (nta a) gamānurasa (nusārī) hi dṛṣṭaphalamapi bhojanādi prāṇāḥ (ṇāyāma) sandhyādyā ityāgamanusandhānenopabṛṅhayanti. AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 4-6.

1a *NŚ*, 33.1.

1b *Ibid.*, 28.36. Cf. *rañjanā janacittānāṁ sa ca rāga udahṛtaḥ. Bṛ.*, 281.

1c *AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 3.

2 *NŚ*, 32. 8 : *dhruvām anyonyasambaddhāḥ.*

3 *Ibid.*, 32. 310; also *ibid*, 6. 29-30.

4 *Ibid.*, 32 311.

5 *Ibid.*, 32. 312.

6 *Ibid.*, 32. 313.

7 *Ibid.*, 32. 315.

8 *Anukarturyadanāśaṁkitadhanaviṣayādatyuddhataprayogaśrama vaśādvā bhramādidoṣasambhāvanā. Vastrabharaṇāvakāśāditsayā (yā) gīyate sāntarā dhruvā. AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 315.

9 *Atimagnacittavṛtterapi Sāgarikāyā manorathakalpitapriyatamasamāgamālāpādevautsukyapravṛttasvaravisayostyeva (Ratnāvalī). Tathā*

cittadrutalayātr-(t tu) prāyastrayṁśakam (?) prayuñjate. *AB* on *NŚ*, 32.10

10 *NŚ*. 32. 327.

11 *Śaṁkhacūḍasyeva Jīmūtavāhanabhakṣaṇākulagaruḍanikaṭamupasarpataḥ.* (*Nāgānandam*, 5. 17). *AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 327.

12 *Yathā Udāttarāghave rāmasya prastutaśṛṅgārakramollaṁghanena—'Are tāpasa sthiri (ro) bhava. Kvedānīm gamyate. Svasurmama parābhavaprasava ekadattavyatha'. Ityādinā rāvaṇavākyena. Yathā (druta) vākyākarṇanena vīrarasasyākṣepyasya tu rasasya māsṛṇye 'Sthite' vilambitā. Yathāśvatthāmno yuddhavīre kramollaṅghanena 'kutodyāpi te tātaḥ' iti nepathyaśravaṇādi tasya karuṇarasasya.* (*Veṇīsaṁhāram*, 3.8). *AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 313.

12a It is interesting to note that the *Bṛ* 326 and *SR* 2.284 enjoin the *rāga Bhinnapañcama* to be used at the entrance of the *sūtradhāra*.

13 *Kuṭṭinīmatam*, 779-883; also *ibid.*, 927.

14 This verse is not available in the present editions of the *NŚ*, but it seems that during Abhinava's time certain recensions of the *NŚ* contained this verse. Abhinava thinks that this verse is interpolated since it is not found in his manuscript—*asmatpustakeṣu na tathā dṛśyate* (*AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 141). Despite this fact he agrees with it and argues that whether the verse is interpolated or not is not relevant as Bharata had already suggested the matter expressed in the verse at another place where he enumerates the *aṁśas*—*na ca tayā vinā na saṁgṛhītametadbhavati, jātyaṁśake hi sarvaṁ svīkṛtaṁ tatrāpi cā (mā)-rjanopayogino vaicitryasyābhyanujñānaṁ munināiva kṛtam. Catuḥsvaraprayogo' pi 'hyavakṛṣṭadhruvāsviha'* (*Bh. NŚ*, 28. 79) *iti vadattottaratra cālaṁkāravaicitrayaṁ vibhajajeti.* *AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 141.

15 *AB* on *NŚ*, 82. 141.

16 *Guḍamaricādirasayojanāmaye'pi pānaka iva rasāntaratvam.* *AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 332.

17 *Tatra saṁkara-rūpabāhulyājjātinirdeśa* (*Dattilam* 96) *iti Dattilācāryo'pyāha. Ṣaḍjodīcyavatīsamā bhinnaṣaḍja ityucyate nandayantī bhinnarūpā bāhulyena.* *AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 141.

18 *L.c.*

19 *Jātisambhūtatvādgrāmarāgāṇāmiti*—*Vṛtti* on *Bṛ*. 321.

20 *Bṛ*. p. 105 (This verse occurs in the chapter incorporated into the *Bṛhaddeśī* from *Sarvāgamasaṁhitā*). Quoted by M. Lath, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

21 *Jātibhyo jātānāmapi grāmarāgasamīpabhāvitvādaṣṭānāmuparāgitvam.* *Kalā* on *SR*, 2. 1.15-18.

22 *Kalā* on *SR*, 2. 1.8-14.

23 *Grāmayorjātivyavadhānenotpannānāmapi bhāṣārāgādyapekṣayā vyavadhānālpatvādeteṣām grāmarāgatva-vyapadeśaḥ. L.c.*

24 *Ata eva hyete grāmarāga ityuktaḥ. Grāmohi jātisamūhastasya sambandhino raktyatiśaya iti. AB* on *NŚ*, 29.8.

25 *NŚ* 28. 65.

26 *AB* on *NŚ*, 33. 1.

27 *Kvacidaṁśaḥ kvacinnyāsaḥ ṣāḍavauḍuvite kvacit/ alpatvaṁ ca bahutvaṁ ca grahāpanyāsasaṁyutam mandratārau tathā jñātvāyojanīyam manīṣibhiḥ grāmarāgāḥ prayoktavyā vidhivad daśarūpake// Vṛtti* on *Bṛ.*, 364.

28 *NŚ*, 29. 49.

29 *Nanu pūrvoktābhyo māgadhyādigītibhyo dhunoktānāṁ śuddhādigītināṁ ko bheda iti ceta, ucyote-māgadhādyāḥ prādhānyena padatālāśritāḥ; śuddhādayastu prādhānyena svarāśritā iti. Kalā* on *SR*, 2.1. 6-7.

30 *Bharataḥ punarmāgadhyādiścatasra eva gītiruktavān. L.c.*

31 *L c.*

32 *'bhāṣāṇām'; bhāṣā grāmarāgālāpaprakārāḥ, tathācāha Mataṅgaḥ—"grāmarāgāṇāmeva ālāpaprakārā bhāṣāvācyāḥ, bhāṣāśabdo' traprakāravāci" iti. Evam vibhāṣāntarabhāṣā śabdāvapi tattadantarotpannālāpaprakāravācakāvityavagantavyam. Kala* on *SR*, 2. 1. 19-47.

33 *Bṛ.*, 285-87.

34 *Tatra grāmarāgān vibhajate—'pañcadheti'-grāmarāgāḥ pañcaprakārā bhavanti. Kena viśeṣena pañcaprākaratvam ? Ata āha-pañcagītisamāśrayāditi, kāstāḥpañca gītaya ityapekṣāyāmāha—'gītayaḥ pañceti' śuddhā bhinnā gauḍā vesarā sādhāraṇīti pañca gītayaḥ Bharatena māgadhādayaścatasro gītaya uktā. SR*, Vol. 11, p. 4.

35 *SR*, 2. 1. 2-3.

36 *SR*, 2. 1. 4-5; also *Bṛ.*, 291-96.

37 *Ibid.*, 2. 1. 6.

38 *Caturgītigataṁ lakṣma śritā sādhāraṇī matā—Ibid.*, 2.1.7. Mataṅga says that *Kaku* was also used, in this *gīti. Bṛ.*, 303-04.

39 *AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 141.

40 The text has *ṣaḍja madhyamayoḥ; Ṣaḍji* is in brackets after *ṣaḍja.* Śārṅgadeva (*SR*, 2.2. 27-29) has *ṣaḍjamadhya.* Nānyadeva has *ṣaḍjikā (ṣāḍji)* and *ṣaḍjamadhya.* (*BB*, 2. 6. 84) and quotes Kaśyapa, too, who gives the same as source *jātis*, (*BB*, 2. 6. 85).

41 *SR*, 2. 2. 27-29.

42 Śārṅgadeva gives *gāndhāri*, *madhyamā* and *pañcamī* as the source *jātis* of this *grama rāga.* The same is given by Nānyade[illegible] Kaśyapa (quoted in *Bharatakoṣa*, p. 465).

43 *SR*, 2. 2. 67-70. These two *grāma rāgas* have [illegible] in the portion

Mataṅga who gives only five *rāgas* for the *śuddhā* style. It is possible that these two *grāma rāgas* were created later. This is supported by the fact that Śārṅgadeva describes this *rāga* as under *adhunāprasiddhānām. L.c.*

43a *Vṛtti, Bṛ.*, p. 85—*gāndhārasya cāpaltvam.*

43b *Pūrvaraṅge pracuraprayogatvāttasya śuddhaśadabasyādau nirdeśaḥ. L.c.*

43c The *Vṛtti, Bṛ.*, p. 86, also gives *ga, ni* as weak.

43d *L.c.*

44 In the *AB*, *Dhaivatī* and *ṣaḍjamadhyamā* are given as the source *jātis* of *śudhakaiśika madhyamā.* Nānyadeva, too gives *dhaivatī* and *ṣaḍjamadhyā* as the source *jātis* (*BB.* 2, 6, 181), and quotes Kaśyapa who gives the same source *jātis* (*ibid.*, 2. 6. 191). Mataṅga however gives *kaiśikī* and *ṣaḍjamadhyamā* as parent *jātis* (*Bṛ.*, 320) and this seems more logical.

45 *Vṛtti. Bṛ.*, p. 86; *SR*, 2. 2. 97-98.

46 *SR*, *op. cit.*

47 *SR*, 2. 2. 21-22; *Vṛtti Bṛ.*, *op. cit.*

48 *SR*, 2. 2. 30-32; *Vṛtti Bṛ.*, p. 87 also *Bṛ.*, 321-22.

49 *Ibid.*, 2. 2. 79-80. *Bṛ*, 324-25. *Vṛtti Bṛ.*, p. 89.

50 *Bhinnatāgaḥ* of *AB* should be *bhinnatānaḥ.*

50a *Śrutibhinnaḥ—Bṛ*, 331. The Vṛttikāra explains this to mean that *niṣāda* obtains two *śrutis* from *catuḥśrutika pañcama.* But the difficulty is that how can *niṣāda* obtain two *śrutis* from the *triśrutika pañcama* of the *madhyama grāma* (this *grāma rāga* obtained from the *madhyama grāma*)? The Vṛttikāra justifies it by giving the example of the *bhinnā kaiśika rāga*, where too it seems that the *triśrutika pañcama* undergoes such a change—*Catuśśrute pañcamasya yadā śrutidvayam gṛhṇāti niṣādaḥ tadāsau śrutibhinno' bhidhīyate. Nanu madhyamagrāme pañcamasya tri-śru (ti) katvat katham śrutidvayam grahṇāti niṣādaḥ. Ucyate. Bhūtapūrvanyāyena catuśśrutirucyate Yathā Bhinnakaiśikarāge triśrutipañcamasya catuśśrutitvamāśritya lopaḥ kṛtaḥ ṣaḍjagrāme, evamatrāpi bhaviṣyatīti na doṣaḥ. Vṛtti, Bṛ.*, p. 91. It may be noted, that in contrast to the *dhruvā gāna*, such a change in the *triśrutika pañcama* of the *madhyama grāma*, would have never been permitted in *gāndharva* singing.

51 *SR*, 2. 2. 35-37; Śārṅgadeva terms *bhinnatāna* as one which consists of the last *mūrcchanā*, *antimamūrcchanāḥ* i.e. *(bhinnatānaḥ).* Kallinātha explains this as the *ṛṣabhādi mūrcchanā-antimamūrcchanāḥ ṛṣabhādimūrcchanāḥ—Kalā* on *SR*, 2. 2. 35-37.

52 *SR*, 2. 2. 33-35. Śārṅgadeva does not mention the weak *ga, ni*,

but in fact terms it as *pūrṇa. Bṛ.*, 328. Mataṅga says it is full of *gamakas* in the *mandra sthāna*.

53 *SR*, 2. 2. 82-85. Śārṅgadeva does not mention the weak *ri*. *Sūtradhārapraveśeṇa, Bṛ.*, 325. In the *Kuṭṭinīmatam* (880), where the first act of the *Ratnāvalī* is staged, we have an actual instance of the *rāga bhinnapañcama* being played at the entrance of the *Sūtradhāra*.

53a The *Vṛtti* on *Bṛ*. p. 89 has an interesting passage—*pañcamasya sthāne sthāne vivāditvena gṛhīto bhavati pañcamasyaścasaṃvāditvena (?) varjyate kadācidasau bhinnapañcamaḥ svarabhinno'bhidhīyate*—i.e. from place to place *pañcama attains vivāditva*. Some times *pañcama* abstains from its *saṃvāditva* (i.e. with *ṛṣabha*) and the note is said in a different manner, hence *bhinnapañcama*.

Now the *bhinna* style was characterised by complex, suble notes. Here is an example. Since sometimes *pañcama* sounded in a different manner in *bhinnapañcama*, it meant that the *śrutis* in the *triśrutika pañcama* must have sometimes varied and hence the differing nature of the note. It is then understandable why *pañcama* attained *vivāditva* at place to place. For the same reason sometimes it does not have *saṃvāditva* with *ṛṣabha*. It may be noted that for this reason *ṛṣabha* was a weak note in this *grāma rāga*.

54 Abhinava has mentioned *kārmāravī* and *ṣaḍjamadhyā* as the source *jātis* of *bhinnakaiśika*. However all others, *Vṛtti* (*Bṛ*., 330) Śārṅgadeva (*SR*, 2.2. 37), *Bharatakoṣa* (p. 438) mention *Kaiśikī* and *Kārmāravī* as the source *jātis* of this *rāga*.

55 *SR*, 2. 2. 37-39.

56 *Ibid.*, 2. 2. 42-45—*Udbhaṭe naṭane geyo* (*SR*, 2. 2. 45), says Śārṅgadeva. Kallinātha explaining it says that this means that this is sung in enacting *maṇḍala* while dancing—*udbhaṭe naṭane maṇḍalādau*. (*Kalā* on *SR*, 2. 2. 45).

56a *AB* gives *dhaivatī* and *madhyamā* as the source *jātis* which seems to be a mistake. The *Bṛ*., 335-36 and *SR*, 2. 2. 40 give *ṣaḍjamadhyamā* as the source *jāti*.

57 *SR*, 2. 2. 40-42, Śārṅgadeva terms this *rāga* as *saṁpūrṇa*. Mataṅga, too, terms it as *paripūrṇasvaraḥ—Bṛ*., 336. Abhinava, however, says *niṣpaḥ kaiśika madhyaḥ*.

58 Mataṅga (*Bṛ*., 335-36) and Śārṅgadeva give *kaiśikī* and *ṣaḍjamadhyā* as source *jātis—SR*, 2. 2. 45. Abhinava gives *kārmāravī* and *ṣaḍjamadhyamā*.

59 *SR*, 2. 2. 45-47.

60 *Ibid.*, 2. 2. 120-22. *Bṛ*., 340.

60a The text giving the source *jātis* of *ṭakka* is missing in the portion

quoted by Abhinava. Mataṅga (*Bṛ*., 339) and *SR*, 2. 2. 90 give *dhaivatī* and *ṣaḍjamadhyamā*.

61 *Ibid*., 2. 2. 90-91.

62 The text quoted in *Abhinavabhāratī* is far from clear—*vaṁśānto vignirmadhyapañcamayormālavavesaraḥ*. The passage of Nānyadeva in the *BB* gives *dha*, *pa* as *nyāsa*, *ṣaḍja* as *aṁśa* and *ṣaḍjamadhyā* as the source *jāti—Dhapanyāsa ca ṣaḍjāṁśa visphuratṣaḍjamadhyamā/ parihīnā sasphuritā jñeyā mālavavesarā//* (*BB*, 2.6. 116). Nānyadeva also quotes Kaśyapa, but the passage of Kaśyapa gives *ṭakkarāga* as the source (*ibid*., 2. 117). Hence this is probably *Mālavavesarikā* which Kallinātha gives as the *bhāṣā* of *ṭakkarāga*. The passage of Kaśyapa, too, has *Mālavākhyā vesarikā* not *mālavavesara*. This *grāma rāga* has not been mentioned by either Mataṅga or Śārṅgadeva.

63 *SR*, 2. 2. 48-50; *Bṛ*., 342.

64 For the source *jāti* of Boṭṭa, the text of the *Abhinavabhāratī* simply says '*dhapamadhyodbhavā*'. Mataṅga (*Bṛ*. 343), Śārṅgadeva (*SR*, 2. 2. 50-52) and Nānyadeva (*BB*, 2. 6. 92-93) give the source *jātis* as *pañcamī* and *ṣaḍjamadhyamā*.

65 *SR*, 2. 2. 50-52. The *Vṛtti* on *Bṛ* p. 93 also gives *śānta rasa* and terms this *grāma rāga* as well as *sauvīra* and *ṭakka* as *pūrṇa*.

66 Abhinava gives the source *jātis* of *hindolaka* in a formula like style namely, '*ridhajātya-nyāsasambhavaḥ*'. From Śārṅgadeva we know that *ṛṣabha* and *dhaivata* were omitted in this *rāga* and the *jātis* which derived their names from these two notes were the source of this *grāma-rāga* –
dhaivatyārṣabhikāvarjasvaranāmakajātijaḥ//
hindolakaḥ ridhatyaktaḥ ṣaḍjanyāsagrahaṁśakaḥ—*SR*, 2. 2. 93-94.

67 *SR*, 2. 2. 93-95.

68 For the source *jātis ṭakkakaiśika*, Abhinava here again in a formula style says '*madhjāti-bhāk*' to indicate *madhyama* and *dhaivatī jātis*. Mataṅga (*Bṛ*., 345), Śārṅgadeva (2. 2. 190) and Nānyadeva (*BB*, 2. 2. 101) also give *Dhaivatī* and *Madhyamā* as source *jātis*.

69 *SR*, 2. 2. 190-92; *Bṛ*., 345.

70 *Ibid*., 2. 2. 71-73; *Bṛ*. 346.

71 Nānyadeva, gives *ṣaḍjamadhyā* as the source *jāti* of *Bhammāṇa pañcama*, *BB*, 2. 6. 178. Mataṅga (*Bṛ*., 355) and Śārṅgadeva (*SR*, 2. 2. 60) term the sovrce *jāti* as *śuddhamadhyamā*. This is probably *Ṣaḍjamadhyamā*.

72 *SR*, 2. 2. 60-62.

73 *Ibid*., 2. 2. 55-57; *Bṛ*., 356.

74 Giving the source of the *grāma-rāga gāndhārapañcama*, Abhinava

merely says '*gāndharasambhavaḥ*'. The editor's note below explains it as *gāndhārī* and *raktagāndharī jātis*. Mataṅga (*Bṛ.*, 357) and Śārṅgadeva, (*SR*, 2. 2. 103) give the same as the source *jātis* of *gāndhārapañcama*.

75 Abhinava says '*triśrutidurbalaḥ*' for the *grāma rāga gāndhārapañcama*. The editorial note explains this as to mean *ṛṣabha* and *dhaivata*. Now, the *Vṛtti on Bṛ*. p. 101 classifies *gāndhārapañcama* in the group of *madhyamagrāmika grāma-rāgas*. Kallinātha, following him says .... *nātra, gāndhārapañcamaḥ ṣaḍjakaiśika ityete trayo madhyamagrāmotpannaḥ* (*Kalā* on *SR*, 2.1.8-14). Moreover, the source *jātis gāndhārī* and *Raktagāndhārī* are both of *madhyamagrāma*. In *madhyamagrāma* the two *triśrutika* notes or *pañcama* and *ṛṣabha*, *dhaivata* is *catuśśrutika* i.e. of four *śrutis*. Note may also be made of the fact that Abhinava says '*triśrutidurbalaḥ*' and not '*triśruti-durbalau*', the singular number thus indicating only one *triśrutika* note. Mataṅga and Śārṅgadeva do not mention any weak note, but in Śārṅgadeva's *ālāpa* notation of *gāndhārapañcama ṛṣabha* is extremely infrequent but not so *pañcama*. This is further strengthened by the fact that in both *raktagāndhārī* and *gāndhārī*, the source *jātis* of this *grāma rāga*, *ṛṣabha* is a weak note not *pañcama*.

76 *SR*, 2. 2. 103-105; *Bṛ.*, p. 101.

77 Abhinava gives only *ārṣabhī* as the source *jāti* of *Revagupta*, so also does Nānyadeva—
ārṣabhyamṛṣabhe cāṁśanyāsayoḥ ṣaḍjavarjitaḥ/
jitasaṅgrāmaguptena Revaguptaḥ prakīrtitaḥ//—*BB*, 2. 6. 172.
Mataṅga (*Bṛ.*, 359) and Śārṅgadeva (*SR*, 2. 2. 100) however, gives *madhyamā* and *ārṣabhī* as the source *jātis* of *Revagupta*.

78 Abhinava terms the *grāma-rāga Revagupta* as '*viṣaḍjakaḥ*', i. e. without *ṣaḍja*. It may be noticed that Nānyadeva, too, terms, *Revagupta* as *ṣaḍjavarjitaḥ*. Mataṅga and Śārṅgadeva, however, do not mention this.

79 *SR*, 2. 2. 100-02; *Bṛ.*, 359.

79a Śārṅgadeva says '*nigo nyāsa*' (*SR*, 2. 2. 66).

79b Śārṅgadeva terms *ṛṣabha* as *alpa*, *l.c.*

80 *Ibid.*, 2. 2. 65-67.

81 For *grāma-rāga Śakapañcama*, Abhinava merely says *sadhajātijo*, thereby indicating *ṣāḍjī* and *dhaivatī jātis*. Mataṅga (*Bṛ.*, 353), Nānyadeva (2. 6. 175-76) and Śārṅgadeva, (2. 2. 58) give the same as source *jātis*.

81a Abhinava only mentions the weak *ga*, *ni* and not *na*. Mataṅga (*Bṛ.*, *op. cit.*) and Nānyadeva (*BB*, *op. cit.*) mention the weak *ra*.

82 *SR*, 2. 2. 58-59; *Bṛ*., 353.
83 *Ibid*., 2. 1. 14.
84 *NŚ*, 32. 426.
85 *AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 429.
86 *Maṅgalatvāt. Tathā hi mātṛguptaḥ prathamaṁ madhyamādeva Vāg-devī sarvadehināṁ/*
māṅgalyārthaṁ tadaṁśaḥ syādārambhe caukṣaṣāḍavaḥ//
—*AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 64-65.
87 *Ṣaṭsu rāgeṣu mukhya iti ṣāḍavaḥ*—*Bṛ*., *Vṛtti*, 318; also *pūrvaraṅge pracuraprayogatvādasya śuddhaṣāḍavasyādau nirdeśaḥ*, *l.c.*
88 *NŚ*, 32. 428-29.
89 *Bṛ*., *Vṛtti* on 322. p. 87. *Madhyamagrāma*, *ṣaḍja (grāma)*, *sādhārita*, *pañcama*, *kaiśika*, and *ṣāḍava*, the very six *grāma rāgas* mentioned by Bharata have been enumerated here. However, a seventh *śuddha grāma rāga*, viz. *kaiśika madhyama* has also been mentioned here. It may be noted that the GOS edition of the *NŚ* has a varient reading *kaiśika-madhyama* instead of *pañcama* for the *avamarśa sandhi*. However, Abhinava, commenting on the above verse gives *pañcama* for *avamarśa sandhi*, as do the Vṛttikāra and Kallinātha.
90 *Nanvayaṁ viniyogaviśeṣaḥ kasmāllabhyate ?*
Bharata-vacanādeva : yadāha Bharataḥ—
mukhe tu madhyamagrāmaḥ etc. *Kalā* on *SR*, 2. 2. 21-22. See also *Kalā* on *SR*, 2. 2. 30-32.
91 *Tathā cāha Bharataḥ*—
pūrvaraṅge tu śuddhā syādbhinnā prastāvanāśrayā etc. Quoted in *Kalā* on *SR*, 2. 2. 30.
92 *Vṛtti* on *Bṛ*. p. 104.
93 *NŚ*, 31. 358.
94 *AB* on *NŚ*, 33. 1.
95 *AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 35.
96 *AB* on *NŚ*, 33. 1.
97 *AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 8.
98 *AB* on *NŚ*, 33. 1.
99 *AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 77.
100 *Ibid.*
101 *AB* on *NŚ*, 23. 1.
102 *Dattilam*, 38-39.
103 *AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 34.
104 *Ibid.*
105 *Yaccoktaṁ kūṭatānāḥ kimiti noktā iti, tatra kūṭatvam tāvanna kiṁcit-prayoktṛsukhārthattvaṁ teṣāmapi samānam... Yaccoktaṁ gaṇanā na*

kṛteti tatrānantyātkā gaṇanā, l.c.

106 *Syādetat-tena kim prayojanamiti ? tanna yastadapi samyakprayoktari sati śrotṛṇām tu sukhajanakameva, l.c.*

107 *NŚ*, 32. 1-2; also *AB* on *NŚ*, *l.c.*

108 *AB* on *NŚ*. 32. 3.

109 *AB* on *NŚ*, 33. 1.

110 *NŚ*, 32. 1. *Cf. kāṁsyatālādikam ghanam, Amarakośa* 1. 7. 4.

111 *AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 2.

112 *Tatra hanyata iti ghanaḥ kaṭhinataikarūpaḥ tata iva namanonnamanaśaithilyādiyogabhavādakṣaravaicitryaṁ cānuruddhya, mānamātrenopayogikaṁsatālikādirucyate—AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 1.

113 See Lath, *A Study of Dattilam*, pp. 103-04; also appendix, pp. 451-52

114 *NŚ*, 31. 14; also *ityatra chandovṛttarūpaṁ saṁsthānam. AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 14.

115 *AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 16.

116 *Dhruvā tu rasādyanuguṇo yo gīyamānasya vṛttasyārthastatrānuguṇo yaḥ prādhānyāt pātādīnāmanyatamaḥ tadaucityenānepi pravartante. Yathā rathagatyaucityād drutarūpe pāte tadnusāriṇo varṇavarṇāṅgādayaḥ. Karuṇarasocite varṇāṅge tadanuguṇā guruplutādirūpeṇa pātādayaḥ. AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 8.

117 *NŚ*, 32. 27. also *Kintvanyathā tasya gāne prādhānyamanyathā ca gāndharve Tatra hi svaratālau pradhānam. Tau cānādhārau na śakyau prayoktum. AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 27-28.

118 *Cf.* also Abhinava's quoting *pada* as being analogous to a wall mural. Just as the wall is the basis on which the mural is painted, so is the *pada* the basis on which the *dhruvā* is structured—*anyepi kuḍyaatta (tra) dṛṣṭāntena tena dhruvāṇāmādhāraḥ padamiti paryāyāt tadvidyate yasyāṁ vṛttajātau sa dhruveti.*" *AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 8.

119 *AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 29.

120 *NŚ*, 29. 26-27.

121 *AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 27.

122 *NŚ*, 29. 49.

123 *AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 29.

124 *AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 30.

125 *Gāyikānām bahutve hetum darśayati prāyena ta(tu) sya(sva) bhāvāt strīṇām gānam nṛṇām ca samvidhiriti, AB* on *NŚ*, 33. 5.

126 *AB* on *NŚ*, 33. 1.

Chapter 10

Rhythm and Time (Tāla)

The various *tāla* structures of *gāndharva* were constitued by basically eight[1] types of beats, four unsounded and the other four sounded ones. The former consisted of *āvāpa*, *niṣkrāma*, *vikṣepa* and *praveśa*; the latter were *śamyā*, *tāla*, *dhruvā* and *sannipāta*. In *gāndharva* these beats were denoted by some typical gestures of hand and palms and one could not deviate from the prescribed movements. Thus these gestures seem to have had some ritualistic significance.[2]

Āvāpa was the folding of fingers with palm facing upwards *(uttānāṅgulasaṅkoca)*. *Niṣkrāma* was the *adhogata* palm with fingers extended *(prasāraṇāt)*. Casting of this hand to the right was *vikṣepa*. Drawing in of the fingers stretched during *vikṣepa* was *praveśa*.[3] Of the sounded beats, or *pātas* as they are termed, *śamyā* was the beat sounded with the right hand. *tāla* with the left hand and *sannipāta*[4] with both hands. *Dhruvā* has been described by Śārṅgadeva as a movement of the hand after snapping the fingers.[5-7]

Bharata speaks of three tempos *(layas)*, *druta* or fast, *madhya* or middling and *vilambita* or slow.[8] These corresponded to the 3 *mārga*, *citra*, *vṛtta* and *dakṣiṇa* respectively. The *citra mārga (druta laya) tāla* was rendered as a one *kalā* unit. In the *vṛtta mārga* or *madhya laya*, it was twice as much i.e. it was *dvikalā*, and the *dakṣiṇa mārga* was 4 times the *citra mārga* and the mode of *tāla* was *catuṣkalā* or a 4 *kalā* unit.[9] The *ekakalā* unit was also known as the *yathākṣara* and was the basic mode.

The various *tāla* structures of *gāndharva* were classified into two basic groups, viz., the *tryasra* (i.e. those structured on triple grouping) and *caturaśra* (those structured on a duple arrangement.)[10] The 2 formula names for the *caturaśra* and *tryasra tālas* were *caccatpuṭa* and *cācapuṭa*.[11] These names do not have any significance in themselves, but when seperate split up into single, syllables of *guru*, *laghu* and *pluta* it gives the basic pattern of beats of the *tryasra* and *caturaśra tālas* in the *ekakalā* tempo. In Sanskrit prosody metre is measured in terms of *mātrās* (i.e. the time taken to utter a short vowel). A *laghu* is a syllable consisting of one *mātrā*, *guru* consists of two *mātrās* and *pluta* three. A *guru* equal to 2 *mātrās* was equal to 1 *kalā*, a *laghu* half a *kalā*, and *pluta* one and a half *kalās*.[12] *Cācapuṭaḥ*[13] was

broken up thus :

cā	ca	pu	taḥ
S	I	I	S
(guru)	(laghu)	(laghu)	(guru)
1 kalā	½ kalā	½ kalā	1 kalā=3 kalās i.e. basically an odd number *tāla* structure.

Caccatputaḥ[14]

cac	cat	pu	taḥ
S	S	I	S
			(pluta)
1 kalā	1 kalā	½ kalā	1½ kalā=4 kalās, i.e. basically an even number *tāla* structure.

Bharata has given three basic patterns of beat arrangements for the ekakalā caccatapuṭa and cācapuṭa structures. These were thus :[15]

(1) sannipāta, śamyā, tāla, śamyā.
(2) śamyā, tāla, śamyā, tāla.
(3) tāla, śamyā, tāla, śamyā.

He terms the first option as a *śuddha* one or the strong one. The second formation, he says,was used in the *āsāritas* and the third in the *pānikā*.[17]

Ṣaṭpitāputrakaḥ : This was yet another *tāla* and was a form of the *tryasra*; but while the *Cācapuṭaḥ* had only 3 *kalās* in the *ekakalā* mode, this *tāla*-structure had 6 *kalās*. Bharata says that this *tāla*, was also called *pañcapāṇi*.[18] Śārṅgadeva gives 3 names for it *uttara*, *pañcapāṇi* and *ṣaṭpitāputrakaḥ*.[19] The syllabic arrangement of the name *ṣaṭpitāputrakaḥ*[20] denoted the number of *kalās*.

ṣaṭ -	pi -	tā -	put -	ra -	kaḥ
pluta -	laghu -	guru -	guru -	laghu -	pluta=6 kalās
S -	I -	S -	S -	I -	S =16 *mātrās*.

Bharata has also given the names of the specific beats and arranges them syllabically thus :[21]

ṣaṭ	pi	tā	put	ra	kaḥ
saṁ	tā	śa	tā	śa	tā.

Two more *tāla* structures of the *tryasra* category and in the *ekakalā* mode have been described by Bharata. These were *Sampakveṣṭakaḥ* and *udghaṭṭaḥ*.

Sampakveṣṭakaḥ was to have five *gurus*, but Bharata decreed the first and last to be *pluta*, which would then total to 6 *kalās*. Bharata says that the beat pattern was to be the same as *ṣaṭpitāputrakaḥ* but that thus was to begin with *tāla*.[22] Abhinava says that the initial *sannipāta*[23] of beat was to be left out. Thus *sampakveṣṭakaḥ* would be thus—

S S S S S
tā śa tā śā tā

Udghaṭṭaḥ had 3 gurus—*niṣkrāma*, thereafter 2 *śamyās*[24]

Thus— S S S
ni śa śa

Thus 5 *tāla* structures of either the *tryasra* or *caturaśra* type have been enumerated by Bharata.[25] Apart from these he says that there are also *tāla* structures consisting of 5, 7, 9 or 11 *kalās*, but these were not within the fold of *gāndharva*.[26]

In the *dvikalā* mode two *kalās* made a single unit and four *kalās* in the *catuṣkalā* mode. These two *kalā* and four *kalā* units were termed *pādabhāgas*. Four such *pādabhāgas* constituted what was termed a *mātrā*. (This, however, was very different from the metric *mātrā* which equalled a *nimeśa*).[27]

Dvikalā mode

Caccatpuṭaḥ—[28]

S S S S S S S S
ni śa ni tā, śa pra, ni saṁ

Cācapuṭaḥ—[29]

S S S S S S
ni śa, tā śa, ni saṁ.

Ṣaṭpitāputrakaḥ[30]

S S S S S S S S S S S S
ni pra, tā śa, ni tā, ni śa, tā pra, ni saṁ

Catuṣkalā mode[31]

The details of the *catuṣkalā* mode have been taken from *SR*, since Bharata has not discribed it.

Caccatpuṭaḥ

S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
ā, ni vi śa, ā ni vi tā, ā śa vi pra, ā ni vi saṁ

Cācapuṭaḥ

S S S S S S S S S S S S
ā ni vi śa, ā tā vi śa, ā ni vi saṁ

Ṣaṭpitāputrakaḥ

S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
ā ni vi pra, ā tā vi śa, ā ni vi tā ā ni vi śa

S S S S S S S S
ā tā vi pra ā ni vi saṁ

Bharata has listed 21 elements to be dealt with under the topic of *tāla*.[32] These are :

1. *dhruvā* 4. *vikṣepa* 7. *tāla*
2. *āvāpa* 5. *praveśana* 8. *sannipāta*
3. *niṣkrāma* 6. *śamyā* 9. *parivarta*

10. *vastu*	14. *vidārī*	18. *avayava*
11. *mātrā*	15. *yati*	19. *mārga*
12. *prakaraṇa*	16. *laya*	20. *pādamārga*
13. *aṅga*	17. *gīti*	21. *pāṇi*

Of these the first 8 as also *mātrā*, *laya*, *mārga* and *pādamārga* have already been taken up.

Parivarta—Bharata does not specifically define *parivarta*, but he mentions the term at certain places in the sense of repetition.

Vastu—Though the term *vastu* is not explained by Bharata, he has used it prolifically. A *vastu* was composed of *mātrās*.

Prakaraṇa—This was the general name for the 7 *gītakas*, also called *saptarūpa*. They were major *tāla*-structures of *gāndharva*.

Vidārī—Bharata defines *vidārī* as the consummation of a *pada* or *varṇa*.[34] Abhinava terms *vidārī* as *gītakhaṇḍa*[35] i.e. a musical segment.[36] *Vidārī* divided the entire melodic structure into segments, and the division seems to have been made on the basis of *tāla*.

Aṅga—Abhinava gives a two-fold meaning of *aṅga* as *tālāṅga* and *varṇāṅga*.[37] The *gītakas* or the major *tāla* structures were formed with a variety of *tāla* constituents. These are termed *aṅga* (i.e., *tālāṅga*) by Abhinava. Bharata describes 3 *aṅgas* viz., *vivadha*, *ekaka* and *vṛtta*. Bharata says that these were formed within the *vastus* and *avayavas* (limbs) of the *gītakas*.[38]

Ekaka—Bharata says that *ekaka* was based on a single *vidārī*.[39]

Vivadha—*Vivadha* consisted of 2 *vidārīs*. The G.O.S. edition of the *NŚ*, apart from this, does not give details about this *aṅga*. The Asiatic Society edition of the *NŚ* mentions 3 classes of *vivadhas* viz. *samudga*, *ardhasamudga* and *vivṛtta*.[40]

Vṛtta—This was two-fold : *pravṛtta* and *avagādha*.[41] *Avagādha* was formed with *āroha* and *pravṛtta* with *avaroha*.[42] Bharata says that the *āroha* and *avaroha* were of 2 types—those based on *nyāsa* and *apanyāsa* and those which depended on the *antaramārga*. This *aṅga* had a maximum of 6 *vidārīs*.[43]

Yati—This is the regulation of the speed or tempo of words of *varṇas* i.e. syllables of both vocal and instrumental melody.[44] Abhinava comments that syllables of vocal melody meant *varṇas* like *sthāyī* etc., and those relating to instrument were *jhantu*, *kata*, *katha* etc.[45] This was regulated by three types of *laya*—*sama* (even), *srotogatā*, (current like) and *gopucchā* (cow's tail). That which had the same tempo in the beginning, middle and end was *sama*; *srotogatā*, like the river current began with a slow speed and gradually acccelerated to a fast one. *Gopucchā* was the reverse of *srotogatā* commencing as a fast *laya* and concluding in a slow one.[46]

Pāṇi—The word *pāṇi* indicated *tāla*.[47] *Pāṇi* here related to the synchronisation of *tāla* and the *tāla*-stresses of the vocal or instrumental melody. This was of three kind—*samapāṇi*, *avapāṇi* and *uparipāṇi*. If the *laya* of the *tāla* and that of the melody played or sung were in in harmony it was termed *samapāṇi*, i.e. their beats synchronised with each other. If the melodic stresses preceded the *tāla* beats it was termed *avapāṇi* and if they followed the *tāla* beats it was termed *uparipāṇi*.[48]

Gīti—Abhinava defines *gīti* thus : "that purticular act of singing *(gāna kriyā)* which is characterised by division into *yati* and *laya* and is adorned by *varṇa* and *alaṁkāra* is *gīti*."[49] Again he says, "by the word *gīti* is understood the mutual dependence of notes and words."[50] The question arises that *varṇa* too was the characteristic rendering of words. So what was the difference ? *Varṇa* was the singing of only a word or syllable in a particular fashion. *Gīti* was a much larger concept and implied the singing of a whole lyric. In fact the difference of meaning is inherent in the very terms themselves—*varṇa* means a syllable and *gīti* means a lyric. *Gīti* involved the singing of not only *varṇa*, but *tāla* elements like *yati* and *laya* also helped to characterise it.

Four types of *gīti* have been mentioned by Bharata, viz. *māgadhī*, *ardhamāgadhī*, *sambhāvitā* and *pṛthulā*[51] Abhinava explains the *gītis* thus : *Māgadhī* is *trinivṛttipragīta*. Thus in singing '*devam Śarvaṁ vande*' '*devam*' is sung in the first *kalā* in *vilambita laya*, '*devaṁ Śarvam*' is sung in the second *kalā* in *madhya laya* and then '*devaṁ Śarvaṁ vande*' in the third *kalā* in *druta laya*. When there is repetition after half of the next *pada*, i.e. *ardhamāgadhī*, some hold that as in the *Sāman Veda*, the repetitions disregard the breaking up of the words. For example in '*jātavedasam*', there is repetition up to '*ja*' and then '*tavedasam*' is sung. Here, there is a break in the middle of the *ṣaḍja-nāda*, but others avoid the breaking into half.[52] *Māgadhī* would be thus :

(i)	S	S	S	S
	de	—	vam	—
(ii)	S	S	S	S
	de	vam	Śar	vam
(iii)	S	S	S	S
	devaṁ	Śarvaṁ	Van	de

In *ardhamāgadhī* there is repetition of the next *pada* (i.e. 'vam' here) :

(i)	S	S	S	S
	de	—	vam	—
(ii)	S	S	S	S
	vam	Śar	vam	—

(iii)	S	S	S	S
	vam	van	de	—

Here there is distortion of words as in *Sāman* singing. Hence Abhinava says that others sing it in a manner which avoids the splitting of words into half.[53]

Bharata defines *sambhāvitā* as that *gīti* which abounds in *guru* letters and *pṛthulā* as abounding in *laghu* letters.[54] These *gītis* were to be used only in *gāndharva*, and not in *gāna*.[55]

Major Tala-structures in Gandharva

The 3 basic *tāla* structures—*caccapuṭaḥ*, *cācapuṭaḥ* and *pañcapāṇi* helped in building the structure of large, elaborate and very complex *tāla*-forms such as *vardhamānaka*, 7 *gītakas* etc., which have no parallel in present day *tāla*.

Vardhamānaka—As described in the chapter on dance, *vardhamānaka* was associated with the *tāṇḍava* dance. It was the *tāla* form which accompanied the *tāṇḍava* which was performed during the *pūrvaraṅga*. "*Āsāritānāṁ saṁyogo vardhamānakamucyate*",[56] says Bharata, that is *vardhamānaka* was made up of a combination of (*tāla* constituents such as) *āsāritas*. *Vardhamānaka* consisted of 4 *āsāritas*, viz. *kaniṣṭha*, *layāntara*, *madhyama* and *jyeṣṭha*. Bharata describes their formation in detail.

Kaniṣṭha[57]

	Śa	tā	Śa	tā	Sam
tā	Śa	tā	Śa	tā	Sam
tā	Śa	tā	Śa	tā	Sam

The *layāntara āsārita* was the same. Śārṅgadeva says that the *mārga* and *laya* were double.[58] Bharata says that it was different from the *kaniṣṭha āsārita* in the sense that the words and the *laya* were different.[59]

Madhyama[60]

			Śa	ni	tā	ni	Śa	tā	pra	ni	Sam
ni	pra	tā	Śa	ni	tā	ni	Śa	tā	pra	ni	Sam
ni	pra	tā	Śa	ni	tā	ni	Śa	tā	pra	ni	Sam

Jyeṣṭha

Bharata has given the detals of the beats.[61]

Śa. ā ni vi tā, ā ni vi Śa, ā ta vi pra, ā ni vi sam, ā ni vi pra, ā tā vi Śa, ā ni vi tā, ā ni vi Śa, ā ta vi pra, ā ni vi sam, ā ni vi pra, ā ta vi Śa, ā ni vi tā, ā ni vi Śa, ā tā vi pra, ā ni vi sam

Each *āsārita*, it may be noticed consisted of 3 units or *vastus*.[62] Thus Bharata says that an *āsārita* has 3 *vastus* and 4 *aṅgas*. The 4 *aṅgas*[63] are *mukha*, *pratimukha*, *deha* and *saṁharaṇa*. *Mukha* was formed in the *upohana*[64] (i.e. the initial few *kalās*) of each *āsārita*. The rest

of the *kalās* of the first *vastu* were *pratimukha*. Now the second and third *vastus* of each of the *āsāritas* was formed with 2 *pañcapāṇis*. In the first *pañcapāṇi*, forming the second *vastu* the *aṅga* was *deha* (Abhinava calls it *śarīra*). In the third and final *vastu* forming the second *pañcapāṇi* was used the *saṁharaṇa*.[65]

Since the *pūrvaraṅga* dancing involved the use of *vardhamānaka*[66] it is evident that it was not a mere *tāla* complex but a *tāla*-cum-song structure. Corresponding to the four *āsāritas* were the four *kaṇḍikās* viz. *viśālā*, *saṅgatā*, *sunandā* and *sumukhī*[67] The *kaṇḍikās* were sung to the *āsāritas* and the *tāla* structure of the *vardhamānaka* was slightly modified to suit the *kaṇḍikā* formation.

Āsārita	*Kaṇḍikā*
Kaniṣṭha (17 *kalās*)	consisted of only a *kaṇḍikā*
	1st *kaṇḍika*, i.e. *viśālā*, rendered in the first
	9 *kalās* of the *kaniṣṭha āsārita*,
	latter omitted,[68] 5 *kalā upohana*[69]
Layāntara (17 *kalās*)	2 *kaṇḍikās*[70] (17 *kalās*) of *layāntara*
	2nd *kaṇḍikā*+1st *kaṇḍikā*
	saṅgatā+*viśālā*
	8 *kalās*+9 *kalās*
	6 *kalā upohana* in *saṅgatā*[71]
Madhyama (33 *kalās*)	(33 *kalās*)
	3rd *kaṇḍikā*+2nd *kaṇḍikā*+1st *kaṇḍikā*[72]
	sunandā+*saṅgatā*+*viśālā*
	16 *kalās*+8 *kalās*+9 *kalās*
	7 *kalā upohana* of *sunandā*[73]
Jyeṣṭha (65 *kalās*)	4 *kaṇḍikās* (65 *kalās*)[74]
	4th *kaṇḍikā*+3rd *kaṇḍikā*+2nd *kaṇḍikā*—
	1st *sumukhī*+*sunandā*+*saṅgatā*+*viśālā*
	32 + 16 + 8 + 9
	8 *kalā upohana* of *sumukhī*[75]

Bharata says that since the *vardhamānaka* increased constantly as regards *kalās* (from 9 to 17 to 33 to 65), words and *laya* (from *ekakalā* to *dvikalā* to *catuṣkalā*–though in effect the speed is decreasing), hence it was termed so.[76]

Saptarūpa or the Seven Gītakas

These were large, elaborate *tāla*-structures formed with *tāla* components such as *vastu*. The *gītaka* was a complex *tāla*-cum-melody structure. Of the 3 aspects—*svara*, *pada* and *tāla*, the first two were secondary and the main importance of the *gītaka* lay in its complex and elaborate *tāla* structure.[77] Bharata enumerates the 7 *gītakas* thus : *madraka*, *ullopyaka*, *aparāntaka*, *prakarī*, *ovenaka*, *rovindaka* and

uttara.[78] These could be rendered in the *ekakalā*, *dvikalā* and *catuṣkalā* modes.

Madraka—Bharata says that the *gītaka* named *madraka* was of 2 types—(i) consisting of 3 *vastus,* and (ii) consisting of 4 *vastus.*[79]

In the beginning there was an *upohana* of 2 *kalās* and a *pratyupohana* of one *kalā*. Bharata has described the *ekakalā madraka* in detail, which can be represented thus :[80]

S S S Śa tā tā śa Śa tā tā Śa tā śa tā Sam

Śārṅgadeva says that after 3 or 4 such *vastus* was a *tāla* constituent called the *śirṣaka*. This, he says, was rendered either in *ekakalā* or *catuṣkalā pañcapāṇi.*[81]

Dvikala madraka—Bharata does not give the details of the *dvikalā* or *catuṣkalā madraka*, but Śārṅgadeva does. *Upohana* is of 3 *kalās*. The *dvikalā madraka* had 24 *kalās*. There are 12 *pādabhāgas* or 3 *mātrās*. There is *upohana* in the first 3 *kalās.*[82]

	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
1st *mātrā*	ni	pra	ni	pra	ni	pra.	ni	Śa
	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
2nd *mātrā*	ni	Śa	ni	tā	ni	tā	ni	Śa
	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
3rd *mātrā*	Śa	tā	tā	Śa	tā	Śa	tā	Sam

Again after 3 such *vastus* there was a *śirṣaka* in *yathākṣara* or *dvikalā uttara* i.e. *pañcapāṇi.*[83]

Catuṣkalā madraka[84]—

	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
1st *mātrā*	ā	ni	vi	pra	ā	ni	vi	pra	ā	ni	vi	pra	ā	ni	vi	Śa
	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
2nd *mātrā*	ā	ni	vi	Śa	ā	ni	vi	tā	ā	ni	vi	tā	ā	ni	vi	Śa
	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
3rd *mātrā*	ā	Śa	vi	tā	ā	tā	vi	Śa	ā	tā	vi	Śa	tā	ni	vi	sam

Bharata enjoins an 8 *kalā upohana* and *pratyupohana* to be of 1, 2 or 4 *kalās.*[85]

Śārṅgadeva says that at the conclusion of three such *vastus* there was to be a *śirṣaka* and he gives four options for it. It was to be formed either in *catuṣkalā pañcapāṇi* or in *ekakalā*-cum-*catuṣkalā pañcapāṇi*, or in *dvikalā*-cum-*catuṣkalā pañcapāṇi* or in two *catuṣkalā pañcapāṇis.*[86] The *aṅgas ekaka* and *vivadha* were to be formed in *madraka.*[87]

Aparāntaka—This consists of what are termed *śākhā* and *pratiśākhā*. *Śākhā* seems to be another name for the *vastu* and *pratiśākhā* was the same but had different words *(anyapada).*[88] The *gītaka* consisted of 5, 6 or 7 *vastus.*[89] Now there were three opinions as regards the *śākhā vastu* relation. The first was that 5, 6 or 7 *vastus* constituted

the *śākhā*. The *pratiśākhā* had the same *tāla* structure but different words. This was the view upheld by Dattila and Śārṅgadeva. A second view mentioned by Śārṅgadeva was that in a particular group of *vastus*, the first half constituted the *śākhā* and the latter half the *pratiśākhā*. Thus, in a group of 7 *vastus*, the first three and a half would be the *śākhā* and the latter three and a half the *pratiśākhā*. Abhinava, however, mentions yet another view which he ascribes to Viśākhila. In a particular *vastu*, the first half would be *śākhā* and the latter half *pratiśākhā*. For example, in the *catuṣkalā aparāntaka* of 24 *kalās*, the first 12 *kalās* would be the *śākhā* and the latter 12, the *pratiśākhā*. Śārṅgadeva does mention this view but ascribes it to Bharata.[90]

Aparāntaka—This *gitaka* consisted of 5, 6 or 7 *vastus*. Abhinava gives the structure of *ekakalā madraka* thus :

SS	S	S	S	S	S	S
	Śa	tā	tā	śa	tā	Sam (scribal error for Sam).[91]

Dvikalā Aparāntaka—Śārṅgadeva says that this has a *vastu* of 12 *kalās*, *upohana* consists of 1 or 2 *kalās* and *pratyupohana* (in the other *vastus*) of 1 *kalā*.[92] The *dvikalā aparāntaka vastu* of 12 *kalās* is thus[93]—

S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
ni	pra	ni	pra	ni	śa	ni	tā	tā	śa	tā	sam

Catuṣkalā Aparāntaka—This contained 24 *kalās*. Bharata states that the *upohana* should consist of half the *vastu (vastyardham)* of 2 *kalās*.[94] The details of the *catuṣkalā* form are not given, so again it is Abhinava who comes to our aid. The *prastāra* given by him is thus :[95]

S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
ā	ni	vi	pra	ā	ni	vi	Śa	ā	ni	vi	tā	ā	ni	vi	pra

S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
ā	tā	vi	Śa	tā	ni	vi	sam

The 4th *pādabhāga* is actually not given and is missing here. But in another place, he points out the difference with Dattila whom he quotes saying that the 2nd *pādabhāga* is formed with '*ā ni vi śa*' and the 4th with '*ā ni vi pra*'.[96]

The one given by Śārṅgadeva, however, is quite different, and is thus :[97]

S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
ā	ni	vi	pra	ā	ni	vi	pra	ā	ni	vi	Śa	ā	ni	vi	tā

S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
ā	tā	vi	Śa	tā	ni	vi	sam

The 2nd. 3rd and 4th *pādabhāgas* are quite different. It seems that these were controversial, because Abhinava too has chosen to comment on the 2nd and 4th *pādabhāgas*. Śārṅgadeva, too, was probably aware of the prevalence of another beat-structure for he comments

that some held that the 8th beat was *śamyā*, the 12th a *tāla* and the 16th a *praveśa*.[98]

Bharata states that at the end of the *śākhā* as well as the *pratiśākhā* were the two *tālikās* in *ekakalā pañcapāṇi*.[99] The *śira*, too, was rendered in the *ekakalā pañcapāṇi*.[100] Bharata ascribes a repetition of the *tālikās* which he terms *upavartana*.[101] After the completion of four *vastus*, says Bharata, should be affected the *nivṛttayoga*.[102] Abhinava explains this as *āvartana* and says that it was formed in the *pañcapāṇi*.[103] Bharata does not mention the *aṅgas* to be formed in the *aparāntaka*. Dattila, however, mentions the use of *vivadha* and *ekaka*.[104]

Ullopyaka—Bharata describes the *ekakalā* mode as consisting of 2 *gurus*, 2 *laghus* and 1 *guru* at the end. The beats are *śamyā* and *tāla* rendered twice and *sannipāta* at the end.[105]

S S I S S
śa tā Śa tā sam

Bharata does not describe the *dvikalā* and *catuṣkalā* modes and simply says that these, can be described by the method mentioned earlier but by Abhinava gives the *prastāra* of *dvikalā* thus :[106]

S S S S S S S S
ni Śa ni tā Śa tā ni sam

For *catuṣkalā*, Abhinava simply gives the beginning '*ā ni vi śa*' as a clue, but does not give the entire structure. It is however given by Śārṅgadeva thus :[107]

S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
ā ni vi Śa ā ni vi tā ā Śa vi tā ā ni vi sam

It seems that 3 *aṅgas* were formed in the *mātrā*.[108] Bharata says that in *mukha* is the *vivadha (aṅga)* and *pratimukha* (consists of) *vṛtta*, thus 3 *aṅgas* :[109]

After its three limbs are completed (*aṅgatraye'tite*), should be the *vaihāyasika* :[110]

ni vi Śa, ni vi tā, ni Śa tā, Śa tā (Sam)[111]

As to the number of *aṅgas* to be formed in the *vaihāyasika*. Bharata states that it must have at least one *aṅga* and at the most 6 *aṅgas*.[112] In another place, he gives the maximum possible *aṅgas* as 12.[113] Śārṅgadeva enjoins the use of *ekaka* in the first *aṅga* of the *vaihāyasika*, and says that the rest were to be *ekakas*.[114]

After describing the *vaihāyasika*, Bharata says that this is the *śākhā*.[115] Abhinava explains that the *śākhā* here meant the *vaihāyasika*.[116] Thereafter followed the *pratiśākhā*. This had the same beat-structure as the former, but was rendered with different words.[117]

It seems that there were four ways in which this *gītaka* could conclude. It could end in the *mātrā* itself or in the *vaihāyasika*. If pro-

longed then the conclusion was done by the *antāharaṇa* (the penultimate conclusion) and the *anta* or the conclusion.[118]

The structure of the *anta* was a complex one. It had three *aṅgas*, each to be rendered in three different ways and various repetitions. Abhinava notes that *aṅga* here did not denote *varṇāṅga* and was something quite different.[119] The three *aṅgas* followed in this order : *sthita*, *pravṛtta* and *mahājanika*; and each was to be rendered in 3 ways in the *tryasra*, *caturaśra* and *miśra tālas*.[120]

Bharata first mentions the *yugma sthita*.[121] The beat-structure as given by Śārṅgadeva is thus :[122]

S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
ni	Śa	ni	tā	ni	pra	ni	sam

Yugma Pravṛtta[123]

S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
ni	śa	śa	tā	tā	śa	tā	saṁ

There was a repetition at the end of *pravṛtta*.[124]

The *yugma* and *ayugma mahājanika* had the same *tāla* as their *yugma* and *ayugma sthita* counterparts, but the former was also characterised by the *nivṛtta tāla*.[125] Abhinava explains that this denoted a repetition at the end.[126]

Ayugma Mode or Tryasra

Sthita (ayugma)—Abhinava gives the beat-structure as thus :[127] ni śa tā pra ni saṁ. This is the same as *dvikalā cācapuṭaḥ*. except for a difference in the fourth beat (which is *śamyā* in *dvikalā cācapuṭaḥ*). This beat structure corresponds to that given by Kallinātha and Siṁhabhūpāla.[128]

Pravṛtta (ayugma)—This was to be rendered with *ekakalā pañcapāṇi* and also consisted of a repetition [129]

Mahājanika (ayugma)—This, as stated before, was to be like the *sthita (ayugma)*, but with a repetition.[130]

Miśra—Bharata does not give the details of the third mode of *anta* viz. *miśra*.[131] According to Abhinava *miśra* could be of various kinds formed by various permutations and combinations of the 3 *aṅgas* of the *anta* (i.e. *sthita*, *pravṛtta* and *mahājanika*) in their two possible modes, *yugma* and *ayugma*.[132] Kallinātha gives the details of *miśra*. He says that this could be formed in six ways[133]—

(1) yugma	sthita	yugma	pravṛtta	ayugma	mahājanika
(2) ayugma	,,	ayugma	,,	yugma	,,
(3) yugma	,,	ayugma	,,	ayugma	,,
(4) ayugma	,,	yugma	,,	yugma	,,
(5) yugma	,,	ayugma	,,	yugma	,,
(6) ayugma	,,	yugma	,,	ayugma	,,

Aṅgas—As to the *aṅgas* which were to be formed in the *anta*, Bharata names them to be *ekakas* and *vivadhas*.[134]

He says that the *sthita* could have either one or two *aṅgas* (*yugma*-2, *ayugma*-1) so also the *pravṛtta*. *Mahājanika* had one *aṅga*. *Antaharaṇa* had three *aṅgas*.[135] In fact, in *ullopyaka* as a whole, Bharata gives a maximum of 20 and minimum of 6 *aṅgas* :[136]

The *prakarī gītaka* had six *mātrās* and according to Bharata was rendered only in the *catuṣkalā* mode. It did not have any *yathākṣara* or *dvikalā* modes.[137]

Śārṅgadeva gives the details of the *catuṣkalā* :[138]

1st *mātrā* ā ni vi pra, ā ni vi pra, ā ni vi pra, ā ni vi śa
2nd *mātrā* ā ni vi pra, ā ni vi pra, ā ni vi pra, ā ni vi tā
3rd *mātrā* ā ni vi pra, ā ni vi pra, ā ni vi pra, ā ni vi śa
4th *mātrā* ā ni vi pra, ā ni vi pra, ā ni vi tā, ā ni vi śa
5th *mātrā* ā ni vi pra. ā ni vi śa, ā ni vi pra, ā ni vi śa
6th *mātrā* ni śa ni tā, ni tā ni śa, śa tā tā śa, tā śa tā saṁ

The *prakarī* consisted of either three and a half or four *vastus*. In the former case, the *gītaka* was rendered as half a *vastu* in the beginning and then the complete three *vastus*.[139] In that half *vastu* was rendered the *upohana*. In case of four *vastus*, the first *vastu* formed the *upohana*.[140]

The *gītaka* concluded with what has been termed *saṁharaṇa* by Bharata. This had the same beat structure as the *kaniṣṭha āsārita*.[141]

śa tā śa tā saṁ, tā śa tā śa, tā saṁ, tā śa tā śa tā saṁ

Since there are 17 beats here, Śārṅgadeva says that the last (i.e. *sannipāta*) was to dropped.[142] According to Abhinava, the *saṁharaṇas* could be formed in place of the sixth *mātrā* of the *vastu* which was formed with the *dvikalā madraka*. Alternately, it could also be formed after the completion of the sixth *mātrā* of the *vastu*, and was like a seventh *mātrā* outside the *vastu*.[143]

Bharata states that the *aṅgas* to be formed in the *prakarī* were the *vivadha* and *ekaka*.[144] Abhinava says that the *ekaka* was formed in the first three *mātrās* of the *vastu* and *vivadha* in the last three.[145]

Oveṇaka—When fully formed *oveṇaka* consisted of twelve limbs viz. *pāda*, *sandhi*, *māṣaghāta*, *vajra*, *sampiṣṭaka*, *caturaśra*, *upavartana*, *upapāta* (also *avapāta*), two *praveṇīs*, *saṁharaṇa* and *anta*.[146] It could also consist of only seven limbs in which case *sampiṣṭaka*, *upapāta*, two *praveṇis* and *upavartana* were omitted.[147]

Oveṇaka—*Oveṇaka* is described as having two *pādas*. Both had the same structure as the *aparāntaka vastu*, i.e. with six *pādabhāgas* or twenty-four *kalās*. Bharata says that one *pāda* was like the *śākhā* of the *aparāntaka* and the second like its *pratiśākhā*.[148] According to

Abhinava, *śākhā* was the same thing as *vastu*. We also know that both *śākhā* and *pratiśākhā* had the same beat-structure, and were the same; the only difference was that they were rendered with different words.

Thereafter was formed the *śīrṣaka*. Bharata calls it *anitya*.[149] Abhinava explains this as optional.[150]

Thereafter followed the *māṣaghāta*.[151] Abhinava says that it was of primary importance in this *gītaka*.[152] According to Śārṅgadeva it was to be formed with *dvikalā uttaratāla* (i.e. *pañcapāṇi*),[153] but it was slightly different. Śārṅgadeva says that the second, third and fourth (*kalās*, the *dvikalā pañcapaṇi* i.e. *pra*, *tā*, *śa*) were to be substituted by *śa ni tā*.[154] The beat-structure would be thus :[155]

ni śa ni tā, ni tā ni śa, tā pra ni saṁ

Bharata prescribes *vivadha aṅga* in the *māṣaghāta*.[156]

The *māṣaghāta* had an *upavartana*, which Bharata terms optional.[157] Abhinava says that it was rendered in *ekakalā pañcapāṇi*.[158] Bharata places the *upavartana* in the second half of the *māṣaghāta*.[159] According to Abhinava,[160] this was interpreted in two ways : (i) *upavartana* was rendered with the same words as *māṣaghāta* but in double the speed, (i.e. in 6 *kalās*) and could be either before or after the *māṣaghāta*; (ii) the last 6 *kalās* of the *māṣaghāta* itself were enjoined as being formed with the *pañcapāṇi*, in case *māṣaghāta* occurred.

After *upavartana* came the *sandhi* which was formed with *yathākṣara pañcapāṇi*.[161]

Sandhi was followed by the *caturaśraka*. As the name indicates *caturaśraka* was rendered in *yugma tāla*. Its structure and beat were the same as *yugma pravṛtta* (see under *ullopyaka*). Bharata enjoins the use of *vivadha aṅga* with the *caturaśraka*.[162]

Vajra, which had the same *tāla* structure as *sandhi*, followed the *caturaśraka*.[163] Abhinava says that this was like a *vajralepa*, re-establishing the *tryasra tāla* which had been disturbed by the *caturaśraka*.[164]

Next was the *sampiṣṭaka*. Bharata gives the beats in detail. "After forming *niṣkrāma* as the first (beat), 3 *śamyās* should be used, and then 3 *tālas*, thereafter *śamyā* and *tāla*, (again) *śamyā* and *tāla* and the final (beat) is *sannipāta*."[165] The beat-structure of the *sampiṣṭaka* would be thus : ni śa śa śa tā tā tā śa tā śa tā saṁ. Bharata states that only when the *oveṇaka* was a *saptāṅga* one (seven-limbed), did it have 12 *kalās*. The *dvādaśāṅga* (twelve-limbed *oveṇaka*) contained only 10, it contained twelve. In the beginning of 10 *kalā* structure, there were only 2 *śamyās* and 2 *tālas* (instead of 3 *śamyās* and 3 *tālas*). Thus one *śamyā* and one *tāla* were dropped to obtain a 10 *kalā* structure.[166]

There seems to be an *upavartana* or repetition again which had the

same structure as the *vajra*, says Bharata.[167] Abhinava explains that the words of the *sampiṣṭaka* only were rendered in *ekakalā pañcapāṇi*.[168]

Next followed the two *praveṇis*, which had the *aṅgas*, *vivadha* and *vṛtta*.[169] Bharata states that the *praveṇi* could be formed either with *yathākṣara pañcapāṇi* or in its *dvikalā* or *miśra*.[170] Abhinava explains this to mean that the first *praveṇi* was in *yathākṣara pañcapāṇi* and the second in *dvikalā*.[171] *Miśra* could mean a combination of *ekakalā* and *dvikalā caccapuṭaḥ*.[172] Śārṅgadeva enumerates four options, viz. (i) both *(veṇi)* and *praveṇi* could be rendered in *yathākṣara pañcapāṇi*; (ii) both could be rendered in *dvikalā pañcapāṇi*; (iii) the first *(veṇi)* could be rendered in *yathākṣara caccapuṭaḥ* and the second *(praveṇi)* in *dvikalā caccapuṭaḥ*, and (iv) *veṇi* could be in *yathākṣaraa pañcapāṇi* and *praveṇi* in *dvikalā*. Sometimes at the end of the two *praveṇis* there was an *upavartana*.[173] This was in *yathākṣara pañcapāṇi*[174] and was optional, says Abhinava.[175]

After *praveṇis* came the *avapāta*. Bharata says that the beat structure consisted of the beats in the second *pāda*.[176] Abhinava here says that *avapāta* meant a 12 *kalā* structure and not 24 *kalā* one, like the *oveṇaka pāda*. He interprets Bharata's phrase '*dvitīyapāda*' as '*dvitīyam pādasya*'. He also gives an alternative interpretation taking *dvitīya* to denote *dvikalā* of the *pañcapāṇi*, in fact.[177]

Antaharaṇa came just before the finale and was to be rendered as the *vajra* i.e., in *ekakalā pañcapāṇi*.[178] About the *anta*, Śāṅgadeva says that in the seven-limbed *oveṇaka* it was of two types—in the *yugma* and *ayugma* modes. In the twelve-limbed *oveṇaka* it was of 3 types—*yugma*, *ayugma* and *miśra*.[179]

Rovindaka—Rovindaka consisted of 2 *pādas*, formed with six *(pāribhāṣika) mātrās* each, in which there were 19 sounded beats or *pātas*.[180] Bharata does not give the complete *prastāra*, but only clues to the fifth and sixth *mātrās*. However, Śārṅgadeva[181] gives the structure of the *pāda* :

1st *mātrā*	ā ni vi pra ā ni vi tā ā ni vi pra ā ni vi śa
2nd *mātrā*	ā ni vi pra ā ni vi tā ā ni vi pra ā ni vi śa
3rd *mātrā*	ā ni vi pra ā ni vi tā ā ni vi pra ā ni vi śa
4th *mātrā*	ā ni vi pra ā ni vi tā ā ni vi pra ā ni vi śa
5th *mātrā*	ā ni vi pra ā ni vi tā ā ni vi pra ā tā vi śa
6th *mātrā*	ā śa vi tā ā tā vi śa ā tā vi śa tā ni vi saṁ

The first eight *kalās* formed the *upohana* and there was a two *kalā pratyupohana*.[182]

The second *pāda* had the same *varṇa upohana* as the first one.[183] It was the same except that it was sung to different words. It seems that *vivadha* and *ekaka* were formed in the *pādas*.[184]

Prastara was based upon *varṇa*. Bharata says that in this there was *varṇānukarṣaṇa* (or dragging of *varṇas*) executed within 8 *kalās*.[185] According to Abhinava, the *varṇa* formed in the last 8 *kalās* of the first *pāda* was repeated in the first 8 *kalās* in the second *pāda*, which also formed in *upohana*.[186] *Prasvara* was also formed in the *śarīra*.[187] This was of twelve *kalās* in *dvikalā pañcapāṇi*. It had a six *kalā upodana* and either *vivadha* or *vṛtta aṅga*.[188]

Finally after *śarīra* followed the *śīrṣaka*, with which this *gītaka* concluded. This was rendered in *yathākṣara pañcapāṇi*.[189] *Ekaka* and *pravṛtta* are the two *aṅgas* formed in the *śīrṣaka*.[190] The *catuṣkalā mātrā* of the *uttara* was to be formed in the *ullopyaka*. The *mukha* and *pratimukha* were also to be formed in the *uttara*.[191]

Next followed the *śākhā* which was to be rendered with at least six and at most with twelve *aṅgas*. Bharata says that the *śākhā* here should be the same as *rovindaka*, but without employing the syllable a.[192] *Rovindaka* does not seem to contain any *śākhā*, but the syllable was a typical feature of one of its elements termed the *śarīra*.[193] It seems that the *śākhā* in *uttara* was to be formed like the *śarīra* in *rovindaka*, but without the syllable a.[194] *Śākhā* was to be rendered in *dvikalā pañcapāṇi*.[195] The *pratiśākhā* was the same as *śākhā*, but rendered with different words.[196]

Bharata next mentions the *śīrṣaka*.[197] Abhinava gives two views as to its formation—2 *śīrṣakas*—one at the end of the *śākhā* and the other at the end of the *pratiśākhā*. Another view was that there was only one *śīrṣaka*.[198]

Bharata terms the *anta* a fixed one—'*niyato bhavet*'.[199] Abhinava says that according to Bharata it is fixed, but others like Dattila[200] think that it is *aniyata* (not fixed). Śārṅgadeva says that *anta* could be rendered either as *yugma*, *ayugma* or *miśra*, or it could even be omitted.[201]

The *saptarūpa*, as already mentioned, was a *tāla*-cum-song structure. The *tāla* aspect has already been dealt with. As regards *pāda*, the *saptarūpa* had a two-fold classification—*kulaka* and *chedyaka*.[202] In *kulaka* the *pādas* conveyed only a single meaning (*ekārtham*). *Chedyaka* is said to be contrary to this—obviously the group of *pādas* here did not convey a single meaning, but were split up to convey more than one meaning, the different parts not being mutually related to each other.[203]

Both *kulaka* and *chedyaka* were sub-divided into 3 types[204]—*niryukta*, *pādaniryukta* and *aniryukta*.

Bharata states that *niryukta* was to be formed with *bahirgītas*, *aṅgas* and *śākhās*.[205] *Bahirgīta* meant a *gīta* sung to meaningless

words.[206] According to Abhinava *bahirgīta* here referred to *upohana* and *pratyupohana*.[207] *Upohana* meant the melodic prelude to a song.[208] *Upohana* consisted not of meaningful words but instead some typical (*śuṣkākṣarasamanvitam)* typical nonsensical syllables like *jhantum*, *jagatiya* were employed in it. They could be rendered both in vocal and instrumental music.[209] *Upohana* was used in the first *vastu*. *Pratyupohana* was used in *vastus* other than the first.[210]

Aṅga and *śākhā* have been explained earlier.

Aniryukta was characterised by the absence of *bahirgīta* and *aṅgas*.[211] Abhinava explains that *aniryukta* consisted of only *vastus* and *śākhās* and was devoid of *upohanas* and *aṅgas*.[212] This, in effect, would mean that *aniryukta* was devoid of *pāda* and consisted of only the *tāla* structure.

The absence of *bahirgītas* was the characteristic feature of the *pādaniryukta gītaka*.[213] Abhinava says that the *pādaniryukta* did not contain the *upohana*. This, then, would mean that the *pādaniryukta gītaka* consisted of only meaningful words[214] (since the *upohana* was to consist of only meaningless words). Such a meaning is in fact suggested by its very name *pādaniryukta*.

Footnotes

1 *Dattilam* enumerates only 7, not mentioning *dhruvā*—*Dattilam*, 114.

2 *NŚ*, 31. 30-31

3 *Ibid.*, 31. 32-34.

4 *Ibid.*, 31. 37.

5-7 *Dhruvo hastasya pātaḥ syācchoṭikikā śabdapūrvakaḥ*—*SR*, (Adyar, ed), 5.9.

8 *NŚ*, 31.5.

9 *Ibid.*, 31. 3-4.

10 *Ibid.*, 31. 7.

11 *Ibid.*, 31. 8.

12 *Kalāṁ auruṇi yuñjīta laghunyardha-kalāṁ tathā/*
plute sārdha-kalāmevaṁ bhava ekakālo vidhiḥ//—*Dattilam*, 124-25.

13 *NŚ*, 31. 9.

14 *Ibid.*, 31. 10. The last *mātrā*, though a *guru* here, has been ordained *pluta* by Bharata to get one more *mātrā* so that it has 8 *mātrās* and conforms to a *tryasra* structure. Abbreviations for these or for the names of the *mātrās* have not been given by Bharata, but were in use later. They have been used here for the sake of convenience (abbreviations) : *āvāpa*=ā; *niṣkrāma*=ni; *vikṣepa*=vi; *praveśa*=pra; *śamyā*=ś; *tāla*=tā; *sannipāta*=saṁ.

15 *Ibid.*, 31. 11-13.

16 *Ibid.*, 31.11; also 31.15.
17 *Ibid.*, 31. 13-14.
18 *Ibid.*, 31.17.
19 *SR*, 5. 23; also *Dattilam*, 127.
20 *NŚ*, 31. 17-19. The first and last *guru* have been ordained as *pluta* by Bharata.
21 *Ibid.*, 31. 62-63; also *ibid.*, 31.20.
22 *Ibid.*, 31.21.
23 *Gurupañcagrahaṇāt pañcapāṇipadaṁ sannipātabhedeneti tāvatā māt-rābhidhāne asannipāta-niyamo labdhaḥ tena* tā saṁ tā saṁ tā *tāla-syaiva bhedaḥ—AB, l.c.*; saṁ here is obviously a scribal error for śa.
24 *NŚ*, 31. 22.
25 *Ibid.*, 31. 33.
26 *Ibid.*, 31. 24-25.
27 *Ibid.*, 31. 52. *NŚ*, 28. 19 has the term *pādamārga*. Dattila terms this *mātrā* as *mātrā* by *paribhāṣā* (*Dattilam*, 931), possibly to distinguish it from other types of *mātrā*. For further detail see Lath, *A Study of Dattilam*, pp. 330ff.
28 *NŚ*, 31. 41-43; also *SR*, 5. 30.
29 *NŚ*, 31. 44-46; *SR*, 5. 31.
30 *NŚ*, 31. 47-50; *SR*, *l.c.*
31 *SR* 5. 32.
32 *NŚ*, 28. 18-20.
33 Cf. *Dattilam*, 138.
34 *NŚ*, 32. 17.
35 *Vidārī* is defined as the *gīta khaṇḍa* i.e. a sub-section of a melody. As 'S' elucidates, "*vidārī* is that which divides either the tonal content or the verbal content of a melody and is thereby two-fold, viz. *gīta vidārī*, i.e. a melodic divisor or a *pāda vidārī* i.e. a verbal divisor (*SR*, 1, p. 183). R.K. Shringy and Premlata Sharma, *Saṅgītaratnākara of Śārṅgadeva*, p. 283, fn. 2
36 *AB* ad *NŚ*, *l.c.*
37 *AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 192.
38 *NŚ*, 31. 190-91.
39 *NŚ*, 31. 192. Verse 217 of Ch. 31 of the Asiatic Society ed. of the *NŚ* says that the *vivadha*, *ekaka* and *vṛtta* are to end in the *nyāsa*, *apanyāsa* and *aṁśa*. Cf. *Dattilam*, 144; *SR*, 5. 77.
40 *NŚ*, 31. 152.
41 *NŚ* (Asiatic Society ed.) 31. 212. Dattila characterises the three classes of *vivadha* as *sama*, *madhyama* and *viṣama—Dattilam*, 148-49. These related to the resemblance (as regards *svara*, *varṇa* and *pāda*) between the two *vidārī* divisions. *Sama* and *madhyama* correspon-

ded to complete and partial resemblance and the third to dissimilarity—Lath, M., *A Study of Dattilam*, pp. 358-59.

42 *NŚ*, 31. 195.

43 *Ibid.*, 31. 196-97; also *AB* ad *NŚ*, *l.c.* See also *NŚ*, 31. 192.

44 *Ibid.*, 31. 372.

45 *Gitavarṇānām sthayyādīnām vādye cākṣarāṇāṁ jhantukatakathādīnāṁ sambandhināṁ*—*AB*, p. 284.

46 *L.c.*

47 *L.c.* Abhinava quotes Dattila equating *pāṇi* with *tāla*. Also *Kalānidhi* on *SR*, 5. 28. Śārṅgadeva and later theorists speak of the three *grahas* viz., *sama*, *atīta* and *anāgata* in the same sense as the three *pāṇis*—*SR*, 5. 50.

48 *NŚ*, 31. 373-75. *AB*, pp. 284-25.

49 *Tatra yatikalāvibhāgena varṇālaṁkāraniyamena layagānakriyā-viśeṣo gītiriti sāmānyalakṣaṇam*—*AB*, Ch. 29, p. 93. Cf. *SR*, 1. 8. 14, where Śārṅgadeva follows closely Abhinava's definition of *gīti*. See also Premlata Sharma's detailed discussion of *gīti*—*Śaṅgītaratnākara of Śārṅgadeva*, pp. 376-80.

50 *Gītiśabdena svarāṇāṁ padānāṁ ca yaḥ parasparamāśrayībhāvaḥ sā pṛthag gītiḥ*—*AB*, p. 92.

51 *NŚ*, 29. 46.

52 *AB*, p. 23.

53 Cf. *SR*, 1.8.18. Śārṅgadeva seems to be echoing Abhinava's words. He gives two forms of the *ardha-māgadhī gīti*.

54 *NŚ*, 29. 47.

55 *Ibid.*, 29. 48.

56 *NŚ*, 31. 69.

57 *Ibid.*, 31. 55-59; also *SR*, 5. 183.

58 *SR*, 5. 184.

59 *NŚ*, 31. 96; also *AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 96.

60 *Ibid.*, 31. 97; Abhinava explains that there were to be 3 *khaṇḍas* or parts each constituted by *dvikalā pañcapāṇi*; only in the first part, the first 3 *kalās* (i.e. *ni*, *pra*, *tā*) were to be left out—*dvikalāpañcapāṇitrayadādyakalātrayamapāsya trayaḥ khanḍaḥ karaṇiyaḥ*.

61 *NŚ*, 31. 175-85.

62 *Ibid.*, 31. 188.

63 *Ibid.*, 31. 88.

64 *Ibid.*, 31. 89; *upohana* was the melodic prelude preceding a song and was to be rendered in the initial *kalās* of the first *vastu*. Conventional sets of syllables without any meaning were to be used in the *upohana*.

65 *Prathamaṁ pañcapāṇestu śarīrasañjñayā prādhānyābhinayabhūyast-*

vaṁ sarvathaiva tanmayībhāvāt, dvitīye tu yathā pāṇau saṁharaṇa-rūpatvam—*AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 87-89.

66 The *āsārita*-cum-*kaṇḍikā* relationship has been shown by a chart. The similarity with the *āsārita*-cum-*piṇḍibandha* chart (Ch. 6) may be noticed. Bharata, too, says that this (*āsārita-kaṇḍikā* structure) was used for *piṇḍibandha* dancing—*NŚ*, 31. 87.

67 *NŚ*, 31. 131-32.

68 In the first *kaṇḍikā* the *kaniṣṭha āsārita* was to be used but, it seems, not in its entirety.

Prathamāṁ kaṇḍikāṁ kṛtvā bālatālaprayojitam/
antimārdhakalāhīnaṁ kuryadevaṁ kaniṣṭhakam// —*NŚ*, 31. 81.

i.e., the first *kaṇḍikā* is to be formed by using the *bāla-tāla* and depleting the latter half of the *kaniṣṭha āsārita*. Now the *kaniṣṭha āsārita* had 17 *kalās*. How many *kalās* were to be in the latter half and how many did the *bāla-tāla* consist of? Bharata later answers the question—*bālaṁ navakālaṁ jñeyam* (*ibid.*, 31.155; also *ibid.*. 31. 99) i.e., *bāla* implies 9 *kalās*. Thus only 9 *kalās* of the *kaniṣṭha āsārita* were to be taken and the latter omitted.

69 *NŚ*, 31. 132; also *NŚ*, 31. 140.

70 *Ibid.*, 31. 82; *AB* on *NŚ* 31. 82.

71 *NŚ*, 31. 133.

72 *Ibid.*, 31. 85. *AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 85.

73 *NŚ*, 31. 133.

74 *Ibid.*, 31. 86. *AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 86.

75 *NŚ*, 31. 133.

76 *Ibid.*, 31. 156.

77 *Gītakādau tālabhāgasyaiva prādhānyam*—*AB*, p. 54 on *NŚ*, 28. 95-97. *Sarveṣāṁ gītānāṁ tālasyaiva hi mukhyatā*, *BB*, 8. 2; also *SR*, 5. 53.

78 *NŚ* 31. 200-01.

79 Dattila also adds that it was formed with 3 *mātrās (pāribhāṣikī) trimātram vastu*—*Dattilam* 161. *NŚ*. 31. 201.

80 *NŚ*, 31. 230-34. Abhinava (*AB*, *ibid*) and following him Śārṅgadeva (*SR*, 5. 77) have the same *prastāra* except that the seventh beat is a *śamyā* (Bharata ordains that the sixth and seventh beats should be *tāla*).

81 *SR*, 5. 77. Bharata enjoins that the *yathākṣara* as also the *catuṣkalā madraka* were to have the *śīrṣaka* in *catuṣkalā pañcapāṇi*, but the *dvikalā madraka* was to have the *śīrṣaka* in *dvikalā pañcapāṇi* (*NŚ*, 31. 238-39). Abhinava gives this as well as another mode too viz. *ekakalā, dvikalā catuṣkalā madraka* were to have *ekakalā, dvikalā, catuṣkalā pañcapāṇi, śīrṣakas AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 239. Śārṅgadeva

seems to follow Bharata's injunction in part and since his exposition is a coherent one, we have followed his description.

82 *SR*, 5. 78-79.
83 *L.c.*
84 *NŚ*, 31. 236; *SR*, 5.87. Cf. *Dattilam*, 161-167; also *S. Raj.*, 2. 4, 1. 98-100.
85 *NŚ*, 31. 237-38.
86 *SR*, 5 87.
87 *NŚ*, 31. 193.
88 *NŚ*, 31. 247; also *AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 252; *SR*, 5. 89.
89 *NŚ*, 31. 202; also *AB*, *ibid.*
90 *AB* ad *NŚ*. 31. 252. *SR*, 5. 89-91.
91 *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 243; *SR*, 5. 95.
92 *SR*, 5. 95-97.
93 *Ibid.*, 5. 99.
94 *NŚ*, 31. 251; also *AB*, *ibid.*
95 *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 245.
96 *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 251. Cf. *Dattilam*, 172-73.
97 *SR*, 5. 103-04.
98 *L.c.*
99 *NŚ*, 31. 249-50.
100 *Ibid.*, 31. 248. Śārṅgadeva puts the *talika* and the *śira* (he calls it *śīrṣaka*) after each *śākhā* and *pratiśākhā* in all 3 *mārgas—ekakalā, dvikalā, catuṣkalā.*
101 *NŚ*, 31. 250.
102 *NŚ*, 31. 248.
103 *AB*, *ibid.*
104 *Dattilam*, 179.
105 *NŚ*, 31. 252; also *SR*, 5. 128.
106 *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 254; also *SR*, 5. 129.
107 *SR*, 5. 130.
108 *NŚ*, 31. 254; also *NŚ*. 31. 223.
109 *Ibid.*, 31. 225. *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 225.
110 *NŚ*, 31. 254.
111 *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 256-57. *Saṁ* has to be jotted down which must have been a scribal lapse; see *SR*, 5. 130-31.
112 *NŚ*. 31, 223.
113 *Ibid.*, 31. 255.
114 *SR*, 5. 114.
115 *NŚ*, 31. 257.
116 *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 256-57.
117 *NŚ*, 31. 257.

118 *Ibid.*, 31. 258-59; *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 259; also *SR*, 5. 133.
119 *Atra yat pravṛttamuktaṁ na tu varṇāṅgarūpam*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 265.
120 *NŚ*, 31. 260.
121 *NŚ*, 31. 261.
122 *SR*, chart at the end of 5. 133 (on p. 79).
123 *L.c.* Abhinava gives the some *prastāra*, except for the third beat which he erroneously terms a *tāla*. *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 263.
124 *NŚ*, 31. 264.
125 *L.c.*
126 *NŚ*, 31. 264.
127 *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 268.
128 *Ayugmasthitam yathā—ṣaḍgurūn likhitvā tadadho niśatā praniśān likhet—Kalānidhi*, p. 82. *Tatra sthite caturthaḥ praveśaḥ anyat dvi-kalācacapuṭavat.—Saṅgītasudhākara* on *SR*, 5. 131-33.
129 *NŚ*, 31. 269; *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 269.
130 *NŚ*, 31. 270; *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 270.
131 *NŚ*, 31. 271.
132 *Ibid.*, 31. 271.
133 *Kalānidhi*, p. 82.
134 *NŚ*, 31. 271.
135 *Ibid.*, 31. 272-73.
136 *Ibid.*, 31. 221.
137 *Ibid*, 31. 275-76.
138 *SR*, 5. 142.
139 *NŚ*, 31. 280.
140 *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 280; *SR*, 5. 134-36.
141 *NŚ*, 31. 281.
142 *SR*, 5. 142.
143 *Eṣā ca mātrā dvaikalā-madrakatāiaḥ ṣaṣṭhamātrāsthāne kāryeti kecit. Anye tvayastuni saptamyaiveyam mātreti manyante.*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 281; also *SR*, 5. 137-38.
144 *NŚ*, 31. 193.
145 *Vivadhaikake tisrṣu mātrāsu vibhajyate*—*AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 193.
146 *NŚ*, 31. 207-10.
147 *Ibid.*, 31. 210.
148 *Ibid.*, 31. 281-82.
149 *Ibid.*, 31. 282.
150 *AB*, *ibid.*, 31. 282.
151 *Māṣaghāta evātra pradhānam*, *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 207.
152 *NŚ*, 31. 283.
153 *SR*, 5. 149.
154 *Ibid.*, 5. 161; also, *dvitīyatritīyacaturthaḥ pūrvaṁ pratāśa uktaḥ iha*

śanitā kartavyā iti—Kalānidhi on *SR*, 5. 161-62.
155 *Kalānidhi*, 0.95.
156 *NŚ*, 31. 285.
157 *L.c.*
158 *Tatra caikakalāḥ pañcapaṇitālaḥ—AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 286.
159 *NŚ*, 31. 285.
160 *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 284-86.
161 *NŚ*, 31. 286.
162 *Ibid.*, 31. 287.
163 *Ibid.*, 31. 288.
164 *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 288.
165 *NŚ*, 31. 289-90; also *SR*, 5. 162.
166 *NŚ*, 31. 288; also *NŚ*, 31. 291; also *śamyāyāstālasya ca yat tritvamuktam tadapasārya dvitam kāryam, AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 291.
167 This is a little peculiar because the 12 limbed *oveṇaka* was a complete one with all limbs. However, in the seven-limbed *oveṇaka* 5 elements were omitted of which the *sampiṣṭaka* was one. Therefore in no case could the seven-limbed *oveṇaka* consist of a 12 *kalā sampiṣṭaka*.
168 *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 292.
169 *NŚ*, 31. 292.
170 *Ibid.*, 31. 293.
171 *Tatrādyāyāstālaḥ pañcapāṇiryathākṣaraḥ. Aparasyāḥ sa eva dvikalāḥ yadi vā miśra iti. Ekakalādvikalācañcatapuṭasamudāyarūpe iti lakṣyate—AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 293. However, if both the *praveṇis* were in the same *tāla*, they could be distinguished by the fact that the *aṅga* in the first was *vivadha*, whereas it was *vṛtta* in the second—*nanu yadi dvayorapi tālastulyastadā ko viśeṣa ityāha prayoga'ṅgavaśānuga iti. Ādyāyāṁ vivadho'nyasyāṁ ca vṛttamityaṅgabhedābheda iti yāvat. L.c.*
172 So as to distinguish the two *praveṇis* clearly, Śārṅgadeva terms them *veṇī* and *praveṇī*, *SR*, 5. 144.
173 *Ibid.*, 5. 153-55.
174 *NŚ*, 31. 294.
175 *Pākṣikam bhedāntaramapyāha—AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 294. The word '*kadācit*' too suggests an option (*NŚ*, 31. 294).
176 *NŚ*, 31. 295.
177 *Sambandhe dvikalā-pañcapāṇitāla eva labhyata iti—AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 295.
178 *NŚ*, 31. 295.
179 *SR*, p. 95.
180 *Ibid.*, 31. 296.

181 Chart after *SR*, 5. 174.
182 *NŚ*, 31. 299.
183 *Ibid.*, 31. 301; also *ibid.*, 31. 204.
184 *SR*, 5. 165; *NŚ* 31. 300.
185 *NŚ*, 31. 300. *Varṇa* was of 4 types—*sthāyī, sañcārī, ārohī ovarohī.*
186 *Varṇasya gītivarṇasya gītilakṣaṇasyānukarṣāt pratyānayanapratyāsatyā prāpya padāntyamātrāparyantaṁ kalāṣṭaka-niviṣṭasya dvitīyapādaprathama-mātrādyākalātmakopohanātmani punaryojanaṁ so'nya itara gītakāsādhāraṇaḥ prasvāro nāmāṅgaṁ. prakarṣeṇa svaruṇāṁ sabdasyeti. Samanvatvam hiti trigitdbhavati prathamapadasyante dvitīyasyadyantayoriti*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 300.
187 *NŚ*, 31. 301.
188 *Ibid.*, 31. 302-04.
189 *NŚ*, 31. 305.
190 *Ibid.*, 31. 306.
191 *Ibid.*, 31. 307-08.
192 *Ibid.*, 31. 309.
193 *NŚ*, 3. 304; *AB*, *ibid.*
194 Abhinava says that the *pratiśākhā*, (which was the same as *śākhā*) was based upon the *śarīra* of the *rovindaka*—*evaṁbhūtaiva pratiśākhānya-pāda, atra ca rovindakānantaryaccharīratvamupajivyata iti. AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 310-11. Śārṅgadeva states that the *varṇāṅga* of the *śākhā* is the same as in *śarīra*, but the syllable *a* is excluded—*akāravarjam śākhāyaṁ gītāṅgaṁ śarīravat. SR*, 5. 178.
195 *Anantaraṁ dvādaśabhiḥ kalābhiḥ śākhā-tatra pātāḥ saducyante. Tasyāṁ tu tri (dvi) kalāstāla iti kalā dvādaśakālena prakārāṇāṁ dvikalāḥ pañcapāṇirākṣiptaḥ*—*AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 310-11.
196 *NŚ*, 31. 311.
197 *Ibid.*, 31. 312.
198 *Asyeti śākhāpratiśākhāṁpaśyanta iti pratiśākhāyāḥ samāptau. Madhya iti śākhā-pratiśākhe. Antaraśirṣakamiti śirṣakadvayaṁ anye tvekameva śirṣakaṁ tathā kāryaṁ yathā....'nte madhye ca kṛtaṁ bhavatīti vyācakṣate, tena śākhānte śirṣakaṁ kāryamityuktam bhavati*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 312. Śārṅgadeva held that the *śirṣaka* was formed between the *śākhā and pratiśākhā. SR*, 5. 175-76.
199 *NŚ*, 31. 312.
200 *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 312.
201 *SR*, 5. 177.
202 The original text has '*chedyaka*' not '*bhedyaka*'. It has been read as *bhedyaka* by editor, since the *AB* has this term. But at another place (*AB* on *NŚ*, 32. 27). Abhinava has used the term '*chedya*'. Dattila and Śārṅgadeva, too, use the term '*chedyaka*'. Hence it

seems more appropriate to use the term *chedyaka*. Perhaps *bhedyaka*, used by Abhinava, was a variant name of the same term.

203 *Ibid., l.c.* As regards *kulaka*, Abhinava says that it either conveyed a single meaning or a co-ordinated meaning with different parts mutually related—*ekārthaparasparānvitārthavastvaṅgayuktam kulakaṁ viparītaṁ bhedyakam*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 321.

204 *NŚ*, 31. 322.

205 *Ibid.*, 31. 323.

206 Compare with the present-day *tarānā*.

207 *Bahirgītenopohanapratyupohanātmanā*—*AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 323.

208 *NŚ*, 31. 138.

209 On the *vīṇā*, meaningless syllables like *jhantum* etc., formed the bases of making different strokes. *AB* ad *NŚ*, 34. 33.

210 *AB* ad *NŚ*, 31. 230-34.

211 *NŚ*, 31. 323.

212 *Nihśeṣa svarūpayogādvastuśākhāmātrā-rūpamupohanāntairaṅgaiśca hīnamaniryuktam*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 323.

213 *NŚ*, 31. 324.

214 *Upohanaireva hīnaṁ pādaniryuktam, arthapratītinibandhanapariśleṣatāyogāt*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 31. 324.

Chapter 11

Musical Instruments

Tata Vadya or Stringed Instruments

In the very first verse of the twenty-eighth chapter of the section on music in the *NŚ*, Bharata mentions a four-fold classification of musical instruments viz. *tata* (cordophones), *avanaddha* (membranophones). *ghana* (idiophones) and *suṣira* (areophones).[1] *Tatam tantrikṛtam*,[2] says Bharata, i.e. *tata vādya* are stringed instruments like the *vīṇā*. Amongst the ancient Indian instruments, the *vīṇā* occupies the place of importance in *gāndharva* music.[3] *Tānā, śruti, śuṣka, vṛtti* etc., were all basically elements of *vīṇā* playing. Though these could be rendered by the *śārīrī vīṇā*, yet they were more convenient and more appropriate to the *dāravī vīṇā*. Abhinava's remarks on them are highly interesting.[4]

The Vedic age had a number of *vīṇās* like the *godhā*, *kāṇḍavīṇā*,[5] *āghāṭi*[6] or *apaghāṭalikā*, *picchola*, *karkarikā*,[7] *tambalavīṇā*,[8] *tālukavīṇā*, *alābu*, *kapiśīrṣṇi*,[9] etc. The *vīṇā* was however, the most important. It is mentioned in the Vedic texts as well as the *Āraṇyakas* and the *Sūtras*. A big *vīṇā* was called *bāṇa* or *vāna* and it is said that it had 100 strings made of *muñja* grass.[10] According to the *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra* it was constructed of *audumbara* wood and the resonator was covered with the hairy hide of an ox. The *daṇḍa* had ten holes into each of which were threaded ten strings of *muñja* grass, thus making a total of hundred of these. Of these 33 were fixed by the *adhvaryu*, 33 by the *hotā*, 33 by the *udgātā*, and one by the *gṛhapati* or the *yajamāna*.[11] The *vāna* was struck with a *veṇu kāṇḍa*, i.e. a piece of bamboo.[12]

Whether the *vīṇā* was harp-shaped or lute-shaped is a debatable point. Scholars like Mukund Lath, B.C. Deva etc., are of the view that the tuning process described by Bharata and Dattila suggests that the *vīṇā* of their times belonged to the harp group.[13]

The two *vīṇās* of Bharata's time were the *citrā vīṇā* and the *vipañcī*. The former was seven-stringed and was played with fingers and the latter was nine-stringed and was played with a *koṇa* or plectrum—*saptatantrī bhaveccitrā vipañcī tu bhavennavā koṇavādyā vipañcī syāc-citrā cāṅgulivādanā*.[14] The *citrā vīṇā* and the *vipañcī* were the chief *vīṇās*, whereas others like *kacchapī*, *ghoṣakā* etc. were subsidiary, says Bharata.[15] The *saptatantrī vīṇā* is quite an ancient one since it has

been mentioned in the *Jātakas* too. The *Guttila Jataka* mentions the *saptatantrī vīṇā*. Jaina texts mention a number of musical instruments. The *niśīthasūtra* refers to a list of 35 musical instruments of the four classes of *tata*, *vitata*, *ghana* and *jhusira*.[16] The seven-stringed *vīṇā* and *vipañcī* are mentioned in the epics.[17] Bhāsa mentions a *vīṇā* which was nine-stringed and played with a plectrum. He, however, does not term it as *vipañcī*, but names it as *ghoṣavatī*.[18] Śūdraka too refers to the seven-holed flute and seven-stringed *vīṇā*.[19] It is clear that the seven and the nine stringed *vīṇās* were quite popular.

A number of meaningless songs like *āśravāṇā*, *ārambha*, *vakrapāṇi* etc. were rendered during the *pūrvaraṅga*. The *vīṇā* occupied the primary place here since the *bahirgīta* compositions were rendered by making various strokes or *karaṇas* on the *vīṇā* and a sequence of these *karaṇas* was termed as *dhātu*.[20] According to Bharata such music was rendered on the *citrā vīṇā* by playing appropriate *dhātus* alongwith *guru* and *laghu akṣaras*, *varṇas* and *alaṁkāras*. Defining *dhātu* Abhinava says that the collection of the *svaras* that are produced by striking the *vīṇā* (strings) in a specific manner, is called *dhātu*[21] Four types of *dhātus* (on the basis of striking the string by the finger or plectrum and on the basis of *karaṇas*) have been enumerated by Bharata viz. *vistāra*, *karaṇa*, *āviddha*, *vyañjana*.[22] Each of these was further divided into sub-classes. *Vistāra dhātu* was based on the number of strokes to be executed and had four sub-classes, viz., *saṁghātaja*, *samavāyaja*, *vistāraja* and *anubandha*.[23] *Vistāraja* is the *karaṇa* produced by striking the string twice[24] and thrice respectively.[25] Appropriate combinations of these were called *anubandha*.[26] On the basis of the strokes made on the upper end *(uttara-mukha)* or the lower end *(ādhāra)* of the *vīṇā*, the *saṁghātaja* and the *samavāyaja* had four and eight types respectively.[27] The bow-shaped harp gave notes in an ascending scale when played downwards from the top, as the length of the string gradually decreased as one proceeded downwards. The upper strings gave the *mandra* notes whereas the lower strings which were shorter in length gave the *tāra* notes. In the human body the contrary is true, the *mandra* notes being produced from the chest and *tāra* from the head. Śārṅgadeva clearly explains *uttara* and *ādhāra* as meaning *mandra* and *tāra* respectively—*atrottarādharau jñeyau mandratārau svarau kramāt*.[28]

The four types of *saṁghātaja* were :[29]

(i) *Dviruttara* i.e. two strokes on the string on the *uttara mukha* or two strokes on the *mandra* string.

(ii) *Dvirādhāra*—two strokes on the lower string or two strokes on the *tāra* strings.

(iii) *Ādhārādiścottarāvasānāśca* : first a stroke on the lower string (i.e. a stroke producing a high note) and then a stroke on the higher string (i.e. a stroke giving a lower note).

(iv) *Uttarādi-ādhārāvasāna* : contrary to the above.

Similarly *samavāyaja* had eight types[30]—

(i) *Triruttara* : three strokes on the *uttara mukha* (*mandra* notes).

(ii) *Trirādhāra* : three strokes on the lower strings (i.e. *tāra* notes).

(iii) *Dvirādhārottarānta* : two strokes on the lower strings and one on the upper strings (i.e. two high notes and one lower note).

(iv) *Dviruttarādhārānta* : two strokes on the upper strings, one stroke on the lower.

(v) *Uttaramukha-dvirādhāra* : Śārṅgadeva terms this as *uttarādi-dvirādhāra*,[31] Kallinātha explains this as *mandram sakṛducc-ārya tāraśca dviruccāraṇe uttarādidvirādhārau*,[32] i.e. one stroke on the upper strings (producing a *mandra* note) and two strokes on the lower strings (producing a *tāra* note).

(iv) *Dviruttarāvasāna* : this meant two strokes on the upper strings and one on the lower.

(vii) *Madhyottara dvirādhāra* : when *uttara* is in the middle, Śārṅgadeva terms this *madhyottaradvirādhārā*.[33] Kallinātha gives the details by saying "*madhyastho mandro yayoḥ: evam-vidhautarau uccārayet tāra madhyamandratārā uccāryante* etc.; *tadā madhyottaradvirādhāraḥ*,"[34] i.e. first a stroke on the lower string (producing a *tāra* note) then a stroke on the upper string (producing a *mandra* note) and finally a stroke on the lower string again or three strokes that produce a *mandra* note between two *tāra* notes.

(viii) *Dviruttara-ādhāramadhya* : two strokes on the upper strings and one stroke in between on a lower string i.e. three strokes which would produce a *tāra* note between two *mandra* notes.

Thus the *vistāra* class of *dhātus* totalled to fourteen types[35]—*vistāraja* 1; *saṁghātaja* 4; *samavāyaja* 8; and *anubandha* 1—total 14.

Karaṇa and *āviddha dhātus* were dependent not only on the number of strokes being made but also their time span, i.e. on whether they were *gurvakṣaras* or whether they were *laghus* and also the particular sequence of *gurus* and *laghus*.[36] *Karaṇa dhātu* was of five types, viz., *ribhita*, *uccaya*, *niribhīta* (Śāṅgadeva has *nirabhita*) *hlāda* and *anubandha*.[37] A characteristic of the *karaṇa dhātu* was that its last syllable was a *guru* (*gurvantaḥ syāt karaṇadhātuḥ*)[38] and the rest by implication were *laghus*. The number of strokes of the first four i.e. *ribhita*, *ucca-*

ya, *niribhita* and *hlāda* are given as 9, 5, 7 and 9.[39] This would mean that *ribhita* had 2 *laghus* and a final *guru*; *uccaya* consisting of five strokes had 4 *laghus* and a final *guru*; *niribhīta* with 7 strokes consisted of 6 *laghus* and a final *guru*; *hlāda* with strokes consisted of 8 *laghus* and a final *guru*. *Anubandha* was produced by combination of all types.[40]

Āviddha dhātu consisted of the following five types : *kṣepa*, *pluta*, *atipāta*, *atikīrṇa* and *anubandha*. The first four consisted of 2, 3, 4 and 9 strokes[41] respectively and the fifth was made of the combination of the first four. The details have not been given by in the *NŚ* but are, however, found in the *SR* which comes to our aid here :

kṣepa :[42] laghu, guru, guru.

pluta :[43] laghu, guru, laghu.

atipāta :[44] laghu, guru, laghu, guru.

atikīrṇa :[45] laghu-guru, laghu-guru, laghu-guru, laghu-guru.

anubandha : appropriate combinations of the above.

Śārṅgadeva also records an alternate view (*apare*) where the first four types of *āviddha* (*kṣepa* etc.) consisted of 2, 3, 4 and 9 *laghus* respectively.[46]

The first three classes of *dhātus* i.e. *vistāra*, *karaṇa* and *āviddha* are based on the number of strokes played, their time span, their variety etc. *Vyañjana dhātu* depended on the fingers and hands, i.e. which finger or fingers were to strike the strings.[47] Since this was used to execute the strokes of the other three *dhātus*, *vyañjana* was termed as *sarvadhātuka*, and it had 10 sub-classes.[48]

Puṣpa : '*kaniṣṭhāṅguṣṭhaka saṁyuktam*'[49] touching a string, simultaneously with the little finger and thumb.[50]

Kalam : *anguṣṭhābhyāṁ samam tantryoḥ sparśanam*[51]—touching two strings[52] simultaneously with two thumbs Having pressed the string with the left thumb.[53] strike with the right one.[54]

Niṣkoṭitam : *savyāṅguṭṣhaprahārastu*.. [55] i.e. striking the string with the right thumb. Abhinava adds the opinion of his teacher that 'striking on the upper and lower parts such a complex stroke (is *niṣkoṭitam*)'—*ūrdhvodarahananena kuṭilo'yam praharati nirvacanabāladityupādhyāvaḥ*.[56] Śārṅgadeva, too, suggests the same idea, but the stroke, however, is rendered with the left, and not with the right thumb—*vāmāṅguṣṭhena tūrdhvaghāto niṣkoṭitam matam*.[57]

Unmṛṣṭa : *prahāro vāmatarjanyā* [58] striking with the left forefinger.

Repha : *Sarvāṅgulisama kṣepo rephaḥ*. *Sama kṣepa* suggests that *repha* is a single stroke on the string with all the fingers.[59] Śārṅgadeva, however, says that it is striking a single note (i.e. a single string) one by one with each finger—*rephastvekasvaro ghāto kramātsaryāṅgulikṛtaḥ*.[60]

Anusvanita : *tālasthāne dhastantrīṇamanusvanitamucyate.*[61] Having executed the *tāla* movement resounding the strings by a descending stroke.[62]

Bindu : *gurvakṣarakṛtā tantrī*[63]—a *guru akṣara* stroke on a single string.[64] Abhinava says that *guru-akṣara* here means striking a single string for a long time—*gurvakṣara vilambitakāta ekasyāmeva tantryam prahāra ityarthaḥ.*[65]

Avamṛṣṭa : *kaniṣṭhāṅguṣṭhakābhyām tu dakṣiṇābhyāmadhomukham.*[66] Three strokes on (three) strings with the little finger of the right hand and both the thumbs facing downwards.

Anubandha : combinations of all.

These four *dhātus* were classified into four basic 'types' which Bharata terms as *jātis* here. Thus the *vistāra dhātu* belonged by nature to *uddhata jāti*—perhaps because of its comprehensive nature—*uddhatatvāt*[67] (it had fourteen lesser divisions). *Vyañjana dhātu* belonged to the *lalitā jāti.*[68] Abhinava says that this was because of the graceful strokes—*saukumāryāt pravyogasya.*[69] He, in fact, even quotes two examples of it from Śrī Harṣa's plays viz. *Nāgānanda*, 1.14, and *Priyadarśikā*, 3.10. *Āviddha dhātu* belonged to the *ribhita jāti* which was prolific in *laghus.*[70] Many rapid *laghu* strokes would perhaps convey a mood of agitation or tension; it is perhaps because of this that Abhinava comments that this *jāti* was used to convey fighting, warfare and violence, as also backbiting and cleverness.[71] *Karaṇa dhātu* belonged to *ghana jāti* which consisted both of *gurus* and *laghus.*[72]

What was the relation of instrumental playing to vocal music ? The three *vṛttis* described by Bharata illustrate the relationship. Thus says Bharata (29.71) : *tisrastu vṛttayascitrādakṣiṇā vṛttisaṁjñitāḥ vādyagītobhayaguṇā nirdiṣṭāstā yathākramam.* Abhinava explains the concept of *vṛtti* thus : the concept of *vṛtti* illustrates the relationship, primary or secondary, between *vādya* and *gīta* (i.e. whether the song being sung is primary and accompanying instrument secondary or *vice-versa*).[73] In *citrā vṛtti*, *vādya* or instrument is primary. Here the instrumental melody does not heed the vocal music (i.e. it does not strictly follow it) but instead creates a wonderous effect (though according to prescribed rules) quite independent of the melody being sung. The *vṛtti* termed *dakṣiṇā* is quite the opposite, where vocal music dominates the instrumental melody. *Vṛtti* is where both vocal and instrumental music are in equal balace.[74] Thus, *vṛtti* was the general concept illustrating the relationship between the *gīta* or song and *vādya* or the instrument being played with it. Its actual implementation we find in the three styles of instrumental playing. viz. *tattva, anugata* and *ogha.*[75] In the *tattva* style instrumental playing adhered completely to the *laya*,

tāla, varṇa, pāda, vatī, gīta, akṣara etc., of the song being sung.[76] This would mean that in *tattva* song was dominant and that instrumental playing here had only the role of accompanying the vocal melody in all its details. Thus, *tattva* would be related to the *dakṣiṇā vṛtti*. That which follows the song *(gītam tu yadānugacchati)* is *anugata*, says Bharata.[77] This, then would seem to be the same as *tattva*. Abhinava, however, clarifies that instrumental playing here only partly follows the vocal melody. For instance, the instrument can be played in *madhya laya*, even though the song being sung is in *vilambita laya*, or two syllables of the vocal melody could be rendered in three or four strokes on the instrument etc.—*anugacchati na sarvam tadrūpamanuharatyapi tu kiñcidyathā vilambitepi laye nanam prayogam madhye karoti, 'devamiti' varṇadvaye gīyamāne tricaturan prahārān karati.*[78] *Anugata* was related to the *vṛtti* mode. In the *ogha* style the instrumental melody seems to be independent of the vocal music *(anapekṣitagītārtham vādyam tvoghe)*.[79] The instrumental music did not conform to the structure of the song-form, for instance, by not heeding the *vidārī* divisions etc.—*gītam (tasya) ca yo'rthe (rthaḥ) pravṛttirvidārīlakṣano vicchedaḥ sonapekṣito yatra. Gītavidārīṣvapyavicchittimiti yāvat. Ata evaugha ivaughaḥ*[80] This style was characterised by the *tāla-melody-stress* termed *uparipāṇi*, a fast tempo, and was prolific in *āviddha dhātus* (sequence of rapid, light strokes).[81] Thus, this seems to be skilled instrumental playing for its own sake rather than for accompaniment and consisted of rapid strokes on the strings in fast speed.[82] This related to *citrā vṛtti*.

Both the *citrā* and *vipañcī* were the popular *vīṇās* of Bharata's time. Now, in a performance what was the relationship between the two ? It has been mentioned that the *citrā* was the chief *vīṇā* and that the *vipañcī* was the subsidiary one. Bharata gives information about how they are to be played together, but it is Abhinava, however, who provides the details.[83] *Rūpa* : In this, the *vīṇā* is played in *dviguṇa laya* or doubled speed. and the strokes are of *guru-laghu* sequence.[84] While the *mukhya vīṇā* is thus played the *vipañcī* plays two *laghus* instead of one *guru* (which is played on the *citrā)* and two *drutas* (this seems to be a few interval smaller than the *laghu*) instead of one *laghu*. Thus the two *vīṇās* display a charming harmony.[85] *Pratikṛta* :[86] Here the *vipañcī* follows faithfully the strokes being played on the main *vīṇā*, and is almost its echo. Abhinava gives the analogy of the image of an object and its reflection.[87] *Pratibheda* : It is like the *rūpa*, except that the *(citrā) vīṇā* and *vipañcī* are played simultaneously. Abhinava adds that it does not refer to the differentiation of notes according to a fixed programme.[88] *Rūpaśeṣa* :[89] When the playing of the chief *vīṇā*

comes to rest say, during a *vidārī* pause etc.,[90] but the *vipañcī* continues to be played, it is termed as *rūpaśeṣa*. *Ogha* : This is characterised by *uparipāṇi* and *āviddha karaṇas*, says Bharata.[91] Abhinava states that *ogha* is the playing of *vipañcī* in very fast tempo.[92]

Pratiśuṣka : This is the playing on a single string.[93] Abhinava qualifies by saying that it is the playing of *vipañcī* on a single string in such a way that a wonderful diversity is created. The string is *aṁśa-samyādinī*. He also cites another opinion according to which it is the playing of *pratiśuṣka pāda* or meaningless words.[94] In these *karaṇas* which combine the use of different *vīṇās*, we may discern the dim perception of the principle of harmony. From Abhinava's comments it is clear that sometimes the different *vīṇās* played different notes and sometimes a differentiation was created on the same string.

Susira Vadya

The flute was the chief *suṣira vādya* (aerophonic musical instrument) of ancient India. Vedic literature mentions the *veṇu*. However, there are frequent references to the *nāḍī*[95] and the *tūṇava*, as also the *suṣira-vādyas* called the *śaṁkha* or conch-shell.[96] The latter was a part of the musical ensemble of Vedic rites and the flutist was one of the persons said to have been sacrificed during the *puruṣamedha* ceremony (described in chapter 30 of the *Vājasaneyī-saṁhitā* of the *Śukla Yajurveda*). *Sūtra* literature also refers to the *nāḍī* and *tūṇava*; the *Jātakas* and other Śramaṇic literature refers to *veṇu*.[97] Henceforth the *veṇu* is mentioned prolifically. Indeed, the Jaina texts mention a number of aerophonic instruments : *śaṁkha, sunga śaṁkhīya, kharamukhī, parīti* etc. The *Niśīthacūrṇi* mentions the *nāṭikā* and describes it as made from the jointless portion of the bamboo reed (*vaṁśa*); it was also known as *muralī* or flute.[98] The flute of Bharata's time also was constructed of bamboo—*atodyam suṣiram nāma jñeyam vaṁśagatam budhaiḥ*,[99] says Bharata. Unlike Abhinava and Śārṅgadeva, he does not mention the flute being made of any other material. Abhinava comments thus : "Mataṅga muni etc. used bamboo, constructed flutes to please Śiva in devotion. Hence it is known as *vaṁśa*."[100] This shows that till Mataṅga's time, who definitely flourished after Bharata, flutes were invariably constructed of bamboo. By Abhinava's time it seems that the construction of flute was not limited just to bamboo, but other materials too were used. Thus Abhinava says : "Thus it has been said that since it was originally created in bamboo, it is known as *vaṁśa*. The *vaṁśa* are (also made of) *khadira*.[101] silver, bronze and gold."[102] By Śārṅgadeva's time flutes were constructed even out of ivory, sandalwood, etc.[103]

Bharata gives the technique of playing the seven notes; they were

to be played according to the *śruti* divisions of two, three and four, i.e. the seven notes of the octave when played on the flute were classified into three viz. *dviśrutika* notes, *triśrutika* notes and *catuśśrutika* notes. These in turn, were to be placed by three techniques involving the placing of fingers on the holes of the flute. Thus when the hole was left completely free (i.e. no finger was placed to cover it), *catuśśrutika* notes were obtained, when a trembling finger was placed on it, *triśrutika* notes were got and when the finger partially closed the hole *dviśrutika* notes were obtained.[104]

The terms *tattva*, *anugata* and *ogha* are applied to *tata* and *avanaddha vādya* and are important as they serve to show that they were used not for accompaniment, but could be played relatively independently of the vocalist.[105] The flute, however, it seems was used just for accompaniment; its task was to faithfully follow the vocal melody. Indeed, the flute player was to play in concord with the vocalist as also the *vīṇā*-player, states Bharata.[106] This quality is termed *raktaguṇa* by Nārada.[107]

The chapter on *suṣira vādya* in the *NŚ* is a brief one, consisting of only thirteen versese. Some more information, however, can be gleaned from the commentary of Abhinava. From Abhinava's description it seems that the flute had seven holes for the notes;[108] apart from this there were two others viz. one for the mouth and the other at the opposite end. However, only the seven holes that were bored were relevant for the notes. Thus states Abhinava : "Here the sound of the notes arises from the holes which are utilised for obtaining the notes, there are altogether nine holes here. The hole for the mouth and a last hole, being those which fill or are filled, and are used for entrance or obstruction of the breath from the mouth, (these) being the holes of the reed are not used for the division of the *svaras*. The seven (holes) divide the notes."[109]

Avanaddha and Ghana Vadya

Percussion instruments have been classified into two basic categories by Bharata—*avanaddha* and *ghana*.[110] The former are membranophonic instruments or skin vibrators in which the sound waves are due to the vibrations of a stretched skin or membrane when struck. The latter or *ghana* are idiophonic instruments or self-vibrators i.e. instruments of solid substance, which owing to their elastic nature have a sonority of their own, which is emitted in waves when they are struck.

The description of the *pauṣkara* instruments (which is a further name for *avanaddha*)[111] in the *NŚ* is according to the tradition of sage Svāti, states Bharata.[112] In fact, Bharata attributes their very origin

to this sage, and an interesting story is related in this context.[113]

Mṛdaṅga, *paṇava* and *dardara* are the primary *pauṣkara vādya—mṛdaṅgo dardaraścaiva paṇavaścāṅgasaṁjñitaḥ*,[114] and *bherī*, *paṭaha*, *dundubhi* etc. are secondary *avanaddha* instruments. Due to the extensiveness of their surface and its slackness, they do not produce the deep and resonant sound as do the *tri-puṣkara-vādya*.[115]

Mṛdaṅgas[116] were of three shapes viz. (i) *harītikī* or shaped like myrobalan; (ii) *yava* or shaped like a barley grain; and (iii) *gopuccharūpa* or shaped liked a cow's tail. The three varieties of *mṛdaṅga* were *āliṅgya*, *āṅkika* and *ūrdhvaka*, which had the shapes of *gopuccha*, *harītikī* and *yava* respectively.[117] *Āṅkika mṛdaṅga* was of the measure of 3.5 *tālas* and its face (which was covered with hide)[118] was of 12 fingers. *Ūrdhvaka* was of the measure of 4 *tālas* with its face of 14 fingers.[119] *Āliṅgya* was of the measure of 3 *tālas* and its face measured 8 fingers.

The length of the *paṇava* was of the measure of 16 fingers. Its face was of the measure of 5 fingers.[120] The girth of the middle part was not much, being only angular which made its appearance rather thin and elongated *(kṛsakara)*.[121] Its lips (rims) measured $1\frac{1}{2}$ *aṅgulas (adhyardha)*. In the middle there was a hollow diameter of 4 *aṅgulas*,[122] which had 3 strings.[123] This speciality of the *paṇava* is thus stated in the *NŚ* by Bharata : *tantribhiḥ paṇavam caivamūhāpohaviśāradaḥ*.[124] Again, he says, *tantribhiḥ paṇavam nahyet*...[125] Abhinava explains by saying, *tatastribhirbadhnīyāt*[126] Bharata uses the term *ṭankāraḥ* while discussing the stroke on the *paṇava*, and this sounds distinctly like the stroke made on a string.[127] At another place he says—*paṇava antastantrīko*[128]—*paṇava* is fitted with strings inside. What he refers to here is the hollow with the strings. Again, he says—*tantrīpaṇavadau tatāṁśavaditi*.[129]

Dardara[130] had the appearance of a water-pot or *ghaṭa*, and was of the measure of 12 fingers. Its face measured 9 fingers, and had thick lips (rims). Abhinava says that it was like a huge water-pot—*dardaro mahāghaṭākāraḥ*.[131]

The term *tripuṣkara* has been mentioned frequently in the *puṣkarādhyāya* of the *NŚ*. Whether Bharata's *tripuṣkara* denoted a single drum with three faces (left, right and middle) or whether there were 3 drums played together is the question to be considered.[132] Ancient Indian sculptures show both the forms. Bharhut sculpture (2nd cent. B.C.) shows a drummer where two drums can be discerned clearly—one lying obliquely on the lap and the other in an upright position. An Amarāvatī sculpture shows three *mṛdanga* type drums, two uprights, and one lying obliquely behind. South Indian sculptures depict a single drum with 3 faces. At the Naṭarāja temple at Cidambaram, thus, its faces

are to the left, to the right and to the centre. The temple of Kalleśvara at Aralagupee (Mysore) has a drum with three faces, all facing upwards.[133]

It may be noted that the Bharhut and Amarāvatī sculptures are much earlier while the Cidambaram temple is very much later in date. It is our suggestion that the drum with three faces in one is a later development and a fusion of the earlier three separate drums. In fact, the *tripuṣkara* of the *NŚ* too seems to be three separate drums played together (and not a single drum with 3 faces) and thus would support the above hypothesis. The one to the left was the *āliṅgaka* (probably close to the body as the name suggests, perhaps embraced by the arm), the one in the middle was kept upright and called *ūrdhavaka*. To its right was the *āṅkika* which was kept horizontally, perhaps a little obliquely on the lap.[134] In verses 277-78 of the *NŚ* these three are clearly called *puṣkaratrayam*.[135]

While discussing *mārjanā*, *parihāras*, *mārgas* etc. (various techniques pertaining to *puṣkara vādya*) in the 34th chapter of the *NŚ*, Bharata speaks of *vāmaka*, *sayyaka* and *ūrdhvaka*, or *vāma-puṣkara* and *dakṣiṇa-puṣkara*. A close perusal of the text shows that they are mentioned as distinct entities, not as faces of a single *vādya*. For instance, when *ūrdhvaka* and *vāmaka* are mentioned together, they are either joined by the conjunction '*ca*' or put in the dual number. In verse 119 Bharata says that note in the *māyūrī mārjanā* are *gāndhāra* in the *vāmaka*, *ṣadja* in the *dakṣiṇa puṣkara* and *madhyama* in the *ūrdhvaka*.[136]

Abhinava, while discussing the *māyūrī mārjanā*, distinctly defines *vāma puṣkara* and *dakṣiṇa puṣkara* as *āliṅgaka* and *āṅkika—gāndhāro vāme āliṅgake, dakṣiṇa āṅkike, ṣaḍjaḥ ūrdhvake pañcamaḥ*. Elsewhere too, he uses *āliṅgamārjanā* as synonymous with *vāmaka mārjanā—āliṅgasammārjanādutthita mārjanam* (*nā*) *śabdavācyam gāndhāram*.[137]

The *āṅkika mṛdaṅga* is termed *dvipuṣkara* by Bharata. He also says that its right face was pressed by the heel to get the sound of *kakāra*.[138] A lot of interesting information can be gleaned from this. Firstly, that the *āṅkika mṛdaṅga* itself had 2 faces, a right face and a left one. Secondly, it was placed on the lap a little obliquely[139] to the right, since its right face lay towards the heel and was even pressed by it. Abhinava, commenting on the above passage, says—*dvipuṣkare dvimukhe'ṅkika iti*.[140] While discussing the 16 syllables to be played on the *tripuṣkara* he states that the right *puṣkara* has two faces, to the right and to the left. It has the mark of *yava* and hence called *āṅkika* (actually it had the mark of *harītikī*). Its right face had 6 *varṇas*, the left had 3. *Ūrdhvaka* was known thus because it was more than a couple of *tālas*, being four *tālas* (it was higher than *āliṅgaka* and *āṅkika*

which were only 3 and 3.5 *talās* each). It had 2 *varṇas*. The *āliṅgaka* (i.e. the *vāma puṣkara* the *dakṣiṇa puṣkara* and *ūrdhvaka* have already been discussed) had 5 *varṇas*. Thus 16 *varṇas* in all[141]—9 *varṇas* (of *āṅkika*)+2 *varṇas* (of *ūrdhvaka*)+5 *varṇas* (of *āliṅgaka*)=16 *varṇas*. This discussion leaves no room for doubt that there were 3 different drums, not 3 faces of a single drum.

While discussing the four *mārgas* also, Bharata alludes to the *āṅkika*, *ūrdhvaka* and *āliṅgya* as the three *puṣkaras*. In the *aḍḍita mārga* strokes are made on the *āṅkika mṛdaṅga*; in the *ālipta mārga* strokes are made on the *ūrdhvaka* and *vāmaka*; in the *gomukhī* strokes are made on all the *puṣkaras* with the *āliṅgaka* the *karaṇas* being the most prolific.[142] Finally, being the most prolific, as already stated before in verses 277-78, *āliṅgaka*, *āṅkika* and *ūrdhvaka* have been called *puṣkara trayam* by Bharata, and these three were three varieties of the *mṛdaṅga* (not 3 faces of a single drum). In this context, it may be noted that Śārṅgadeva considers *tripuṣkara* as synonymous with *mṛdaṅga*.[143]

The various aspects of *pauṣkara vādya* like modes of playing, different styles, techniques of plastering the drums with clay etc., are described in detail by Bharata.

Sixteen *akṣaras* : The 16 *akṣaras* were ka, kha, ga, gha ṭa, ṭha, ḍa, ḍha, ta, tha, da, dha, ma, ra, la, ha.[144] These were rendered on drums by variously formed strokes with the hands and fingers; some were played on the right side of the *pauṣkara vādya* and some on the left. These 16 *akṣaras*[145] were further combined with consonants i.e. with each other and some vowels a, ā, i, u, e, o, au resulting in a large variety of what we would now term *bols* (something like our present day dhina, na, kit, kat, tirkit, tu, na etc.). Complex conjuncts like *dhru*, *dron*, *klev* etc., were played with both the hands.[146]

The four *mārgas* of the *puṣkara* drums were *ālipta*, *aḍḍita*, *gomukha* and *vitasta*. There were four different styles of playing the *puṣkara vādya*.[147] These depended on the variant ways of making strokes, and the variety of *aḍḍita mārga* was characterised by prolific strokes on the *āṅkika mṛdaṅga*. The *ālipta mārga* was characterised by strokes on *vāmaka* and *ūrdhvaka*.[148] *Vitasta* involved the *ūrdhvaka* and *āṅkika*. Abhinava defines *vitasta* thus : where on the *ūrdhvaka* and on the *dakṣiṇa mukha* or right face of the *āṅkika* the striking is done with great speed on account of the excess of *rasa* in words. He also quotes the opinion of some that in striking the hand is extended only for a span.[149] Strokes on all the *puṣkaras*, with the *karaṇas* on the *āliṅgaka* being the most prolific, was the *gomukhī mārga*.[150]

Trimārjanā : *Mārjanā* was the proper application of clay on the faces of the *dvipuṣkaras* suited for the purpose of tuning it to the

desired *sthāyī* notes.[151] The three modes of *mārjanā* were *māyūrī*, *ardhamāyūrī* and *kārmāravī*.[152] In *vāmaka puṣkara*, *dukṣiṇa puṣkara*[153] and *ūrdhvaka* the standing notes were respectively as follows[154]—in *(madhyamagrāma) māyūrī* : *gandhāra*, *ṣaḍja* and *pañcama*.[155] In *(ṣaḍjagrāma) ardhamāyūrī* : *ṣaḍja ṛṣabha* and *dhaivata*. In *(grāma sādhāraṇa) kārmāravī* :[156] *ṛṣabha*, *ṣaḍja* and *pañcama*.

These three *mārjanās* apparently related to three different *grāmas*.[157] Notes were also tuned with the help of slackness and tension of strings and by piercing of hides to produce notes of these kinds.[158]

Lepanā[158a] consists of the actual procedure of plastering the *tripuṣkara* faces with earth. What sort of earth is suitable for *lepanā* ? Bharata gives the answer by saying that the earth should have no gravel, sand, grass and husks of straw; it should not stick, should not be white alkaline, pungent, yellow, sour or bitter.

Blackish earth from a river bank, which is fine after giving out water, should be used. When this is not available, then a mixture of wheat flour and barley flour may be used. This, however, is only a substitute, for it gives a monotonous sound.[159] *Ṣaṭkaraṇa* : Where the action of different instruments is mixed, that is *karaṇa*.[160] *Karaṇas* are like *varṇa* harmonies, where different percussion instruments are played together sounding different instruments in version. Six *karaṇas* have been enumerated by Bharata viz. *rūpa*, *kṛtapratikṛta*, *pratibheda*, *rupaśeṣa*, *ogha* and *pratiśukla*.[161] *Rūpa* : The trial duration of the *varṇas* are divided into shorter units. Thus while the tune on the *mṛdaṅga* is divided into units of two *gurus* it is elsewhere matched by the discussion into units of *laghus*[162] For example, *dem ghām*-2 *gurus* (matched by) *kitima* is played on all three *puṣkaras*.[163] *Pratibheda* : Where the three *puṣkaras* are played simultaneously, but with different *karaṇas*.[164] *Rūpaśeṣa* : When the *mṛdaṅga* player stops playing, but the pause is filled up by the playing of the *paṇava*.[165]

Pratiśukla : *Pratiśukla*, (it is *pratisuṣka* in the commentary), says Bharata, is synonymous with *anusvāra* or echo. This leads one to surmise that the original term may have been '*pratiśrutka*' which means 'echo'. This would also explain the confusion of names. Here the playing of the *mṛdaṅga* was echoed by that of the *dardara* and *paṇava*.[166]

Ogha : This was the playing of all the *avanaddha* instruments in fast tempo.[167]

Triyati, *trilaya* and *tripāṇi* have been described in the chapter on *tāla*.

Trigata thus indicated three types of song and instrument harmony. *Tattva* : The instrument followed the words *(akṣarasadṛśaṁvādyam)*[168] and the metre *(vṛttasamam)*[169] of the song. Abhinava states :

tattva gītam sarvathā anugatam. He further states :[170] in the *anugata,* the instrument also has equal importance because its movements are freely diversified.[171] *Ogha* : Instrument is dominant here. It is characterised by diverse *karaṇas, uparipāṇi,* fast tempo, and is prolific in *āviddha karaṇas.*[172] The three *gatas (trigata)* illustrated the relationship between song and instrument. Bharata enumerates eight types of equations *(aṣṭasāmya)* between song and instrument.[173]

(i) *Akṣarasamam* :[174] This relates to similarity of syllables in song and instrument. Abhinava explains that song and instrument have the same succession of long and short syllables.[175]

(ii) *Aṅgasamam* :[176] Where there is a similarity between the parts of the developing song and playing of the notes of the instrument, that is *aṅgasamam.* In other words, there is similarity in the patterning of parts.

(iii) *Tālasamam* :[177] This relates to similarity of *patas* between song and instrument.

(iv) *Layayatisamam* :[178] This relates to similarity in *laya* and *yati* between song and instrument.

(v) *Grahasamam* :[179] Where there is an equation in the *graha* or the starting note and the song and instrument.

(vi) *Nyāsasamam* :[180] Relates to similarity of *nyāsa* in song and instrument.

(vii) *Apanyāsasamam* :[181] Relates to similarity of *apanyāsa.*

(viii) *Pāṇisamam* :[182] Relates to similarity of the 3 *pāṇis.*

This '*aṣṭasāmya*' seems to relate to the *gata* termed *tattva* where there was complete harmony between the vocal melody song and the instrument being played.

Tripracāra : These are three modes of striking with the hand the face of the drums. These are *samapracāra, viṣamapracāra,* and *samaviṣamapracāra.*[183]

Samapracāra : Striking the left drum with the left hand and its right with the right hand respectively is *samapracāra.*[184] Thus is performed in the *ālipta mārga*[185] which consists of *vāmordhvakaprahāra,* i.e. strokes on the left drum *(āliṅgaka)* and on the *ūrdhvaka* which is to its right. Here probably the *vāmaka* is struck with the left hand and the *ūrdhvaka* which is to its right *(...dakṣiṇordhvake cāpi kāryaḥ)*[186] is struck with the right hand—*ūrdhvakenāpi dakṣina eva hastaḥ kāryaḥ.*[187]

Trisaṁyoga :[188] The combinations are the playing of *laghu* syllables, of *dīrgha* syllables and of both short and long together.

The union of *laya, yati* and *pāṇi* gave birth to three types of instrumental playing, viz. *rāddha, viddha* and *sayyagata* :[189]

	Laya	Yati	Pāṇi
Rāddha	druta	sama	uparipāṇi
Viddha	madhya	srotogata	samapāṇi
Sayyagata	sthita	gopuccha	ardhapānī

Pañcapāṇiprahata and *triprahāra*[190] were to play various 'bols' on the percussion instrument by striking with various parts of the palm. These were the *pañcapāṇiprahata*, viz. *samapāṇi*, *ardhapāṇi*, *ardhārdhapāṇi*, *pārśvapāṇi* and *pradeśinyāhata*. The contact of the drum and the palm was of three types and termed *nigṛhīta* (palm fully in contact with the face of the drum), *ardhanigṛhīta* (palm only partially in contact) and *mukta* (no contact).[191] *Samapāṇi* : Striking the palm fully open and hence in full contact with the drum face *(nigṛhīta)*. *Ardhapāṇi* : Striking with only half the palm, hence *ardhanigṛhīta*. *Ardhārdhapāṇi* : Striking with half of half the palm, (i.e. the region of the palm base, near the wrist).

Twenty Alaṁkāras : Bharata mentions 20 *alaṁkāras*.[192] Just as *alaṁkāras* embellish vocal notes, so do these twenty *alaṁkāras* embellish the playing of percussion instruments. These are *citra*, *sama*, *vibhakta*, *chinna*, *chinna viddha*, *viddha vādyasaṁśraya*, *anusṛta*, *pratividyuta*, *ekarūpa*, *niyamānvitaḥ*, *sācīkṛtaḥ*, *samalekha*, *citralekha*, *savyasamavāya* and *dṛḍha*.[193]

(i) *Citra* :[194] Characterised by various types of *karaṇas* which are clear and distinct; possible in all the three *pāṇis*.

(ii) *Sama* :[195] Characterised by the *karaṇas* of *dardara*, *paṇava* and *mṛdaṅga*. Bharata also connects the *veṇu* or flute with this *alaṁkāra*.

(iii) *Vibhakta* :[196] Abhinava defines it by saying 'where there are clear divisions in the *akṣara pāṇi*' etc.

(iv) *Chinna* :[197] The instrument (percussion) being played in fast tempo abruptly stops. Abhinava explains that "Even though the *vīṇā* and others keep playing, the *mṛdaṅga* suddenly stops playing."[198]

(v) *Chinnaviddha* :[199] In *mṛdaṅga* there is *avapāṇi* and in *paṇava uparipāṇi*.

(vi) *Viddha* :[200] First the *mṛdaṅga* is played and then *paṇava* is played in succession characterised by strange sounding *karaṇas*.

(vii) *Vādyasaṁśraya* :[201] Where the instrument depends on the song, says Abhinava, characterised by *samapāṇi*.[202]

(viii) *Anusṛta* :[203] Where the *paṇava* follows the *muraja* or the *dardara* follows the *paṇava*.

(ix) *Pratividyuta* :[204] *Muraja*, *paṇava* and *dardara* follow one another in succession in slow tempo.[205]

(x) *Durga* :[206] Pertains to all four *mārgas*, characterised by *viṣama pracāra* and indistinct syllables of the *pada*.

(xi) *Avakīrṇa* :[207] *Muraja* and *paṇava* are played together, but the playing of *paṇava* overshadows the former.

(xii) *Ardhāvakīrṇaka* :[208] *Paṇava* or *dardara* begins with fast tempo and is characterised by *avapāṇi svara-tāla* synchronisation.

(xiii) *Parikṣipta* :[209] Here the playing of *paṇava* has primacy, overshadowing the *mṛdaṅga* which is played rarely, characterised by distinct syllables.

(xiv) *Ekarūpa* :[210] All the instruments play one *karaṇa*.

(xv) *Niyamānvita* :[211] Where the pauses are the same in the song and instrument.

(xvi) *Sācīkṛta* :[212] Where any one of the instruments i.e. *muraja*, *paṇava*, *dardara* (*murajapaṇavadardarasyānyatamena*, *AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 208) plays with various *karaṇas*.

(xvii) *Samalekha* :[213] Where the *muraja*, which is to be played by *uparipāṇi*, is preceded by *paṇava* or *dardara*.

(xviii) *Citralekha* :[214] Where *mṛdaṅga*, *paṇava*, *dardara*, all are played in diverse *karaṇas*.

(xix) *Saṁvāyita* :[215] Characterised by diverse *karaṇas* and applicable in all four *mārgas* and all three *pāṇis*.

(xx) *Dṛdha* :[216] Characterised by *madhya-laya* or middling tempo and well made syllables.

These *alaṁkāras* are prescribed in the *gati-pracāra* or *gīta* in accordance with *rasa* and *bhāva*.[217]

Eighteen Jātis : These are the following, viz. *śuddha*, *puṣkarakaraṇa*, *viṣama*, *viṣkambhita*, *ekarūpa*, *pārṣṇisama*, *paryasta*, *samaviṣamakṛta*, *avakīrṇa*, *paryavasāṇa*, *ucchitika*, *saṁyukta*, *sampluta*, *mahārambha*, *vigatakrama*, *vigalita*, *vañcitika* and *ekavādya*.[218] Each *jāti* was characterised by a particular sequence of 'bols' or *karaṇas*, *mārgas* and *prakāras* constituted by *laya*, *yati* and *pāṇi*. It also had its particular place and function in the *dhruvās*; different sequence of *karaṇas* were played to indicate the gaits of different types of characters. These were also characterised by different *rasas*.

Jāti	*Characteristic Karaṇa*	*Laya*	*Pāṇi*	*Mārga*	*Drum*	*Use in Dhruvā*	*Rasa*
Śuddha[219]	dham dham dram dram kla kho kho ha	—	—	all *mārgas*	*ekākṣarakṛtam vādyam*, explained by Abhinava as where[220] there is an *āvṛtti*	indicates gait of *madhyamā strī* i.e. middling woman	—
Puṣkarakaraṇa[221]	—	3 *layas*	—	—	all the *mṛdaṅgas* to be played with *svastika hastas*.	—	—
Viṣama	them tām kem tām khem tām (long syllables)[222]	—	—	—	—	indicates gait of the king (to his own palace)	—
Viṣkambha[223]	2 gurus, 2 laghus[224] S S I I	—	—	—	—	walking with brisk steps[225]	—
Ekarūpa[226]	—	—	—	—	*vāmaka, ūrdhvaka*	played with *avkṛṣṭa dhruvā*	*karuṇa*
Pārṣṇisama[227]	uttam thikat thim ghikatam matathi also the kle ta ghe	—	—	—	face of drum seems to be pressed by the heel, perhaps on the *dakṣiṇa puṣkara*, i.e. *āṅkika*[228]	—	—
Paryasta[229]	ta ghem tam tam do ghe do hnam	—	—	—	—	indicates *gati* of *madhyama puruṣa* or middling man	—

Jāti	*Characteristic Karaṇa*	*Laya*	*Pāṇi*	*Mārga*	*Drum*	*Use in Dhruvā*	*Rasa*
Samaviṣama[230]	—	*druta*[231]	*uparipāṇi*	—	—	—	—
Avakīrṇa[232]	ttho, ttho matamata[238] ghighi matamata ghighi	—	—	—	*mṛdaṅga, paṇava, dardara*[234]	gait of *adhama* characters[235]	
Paryavasāṇa[236]	—	all 3 *layas*, the same set of *karaṇas* is played in all 3 *layas*	—	—	—	—	—
Ucchitika[237]	ghem tam dohan	—	—	—	—	—	—
Samyukta[238]	tham ke tam ke	—	—	—	strokes on the face of the *āṅkika* only[239]	—	—
Sampluta[240]	—	—	—	—	*mṛdaṅga* played with the movement of all fingers on all the varieties of *mṛdaṅga*	movement of terrified persons, also; aerial movements	—
Mahārambha[241]	—	beginning-*madhya avapāṇi druta-laya*	—	—	—	—	—

Jāti	*Characteristic Karaṇa*	*Laya*	*Pāṇi*	*Mārga*	*Drum*	*Use in Dhruvā*	*Rasa*
Vigatakrama[242]	dhum dhum	—	—	*vitasta*, it is here played in an *uddhata* vigorous style	*ūrdhvaka*, *āṅkika*	movement of heavenly creatures	—
Vigalita[243]	laghu syllables of great variety	—	—	all the *mārgas*	—	movement of *viṭas*[244]	—
Vañcitika[245]	many picturesque *karaṇas*	—	—	—	all the 3 *mṛdaṅgas*	natural gait of superior characters e.g. king[246]	—
Ekavādya[247]	dhro dhro dhre dhre	—	—	—	—	—	—

Amongst other *avanaddhas* are included *paṭaha*, *diṇḍima* and *huḍḍuka*. *Mordala* seems a later development as it has not been mentioned by Bharata; but it was known to Abhinava. Śārṅgadeva discusses it in detail.[248]

The *muraja* is referred to as early as the *Jātakas*, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*. It has also been referred to by Kālidāsa.[249] *Muraja* has been defined as 'a kind of drum or tabor'.[250] From Bharata's description, it seems that the *muraja* was kept upright and beaten with a stick—*murajastūrdhvakaraṇadātodyam todanādapi.*[251]

The *dundubhi* of sage Svāti, says Bharata, was on the pattern of the divine *dundubhi.*[252] The only difference between the divine and terrestrial *dundubhi* was that the former did not have stretched leather for reasons of auspiciousness, explains Abhinava.[253]

Śārṅgadeva has described it as being created of mango wood, having a large body, thundering and emitting a loud sound like that of a cloud. The belly was of *kāṅsya* (bronze), the face covered with leather and was without the surrounding ring or *valaya*. It was struck with a *koṇa* or plectrum of hardened leather. It was bound with leather straps on all sides.[254]

Bherī was used on auspicious occasions of victory, festivals,[255] and in temples. As a well-known *avanaddha vādya* it is mentioned in the *NŚ*. Śārṅgadeva gives the following description—"the body is constructed of copper and its length is *vitastitraya*. It has two faces, each of fourteen fingers and consisting of *valaya* (a ring on the periphery of the face) each covered with leather which was punctured to form a hole on each side. A rope passed through these and was probably tied in the middle. The left face was struck by the hand and the right with a *koṇa* or striker. It produced the sound of *ṭaṁkāra*, (this is usually the sound emitted when hitting a metallic surface) which was deep and terrifying to enemies."[256]

Footnotes

1 *NŚ*, 28. 1.

2 *Ibid*, 28. 2; *ibid.*, 28.8.

3 The *vīṇā* is often referred to as the *dāravī vīṇā* or the wooden lute in contrast to the *śārīrī vīṇā* or the human voice (*NŚ*, 28.12). Commenting on this Abhinava says that this is because of the importance of *vīṇā*, which has already been mentioned before—*dvyadhiṣṭhānāḥ svarā vaiṇaḥ śārīrāśceti—AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 11-12. Moreover. he says, *dāravī vīṇā*, (though) produced out of wood is of the nature of the divine voice (*dāruṇo patyam vīṇā vāgrūpa bhagavatī-ti dāravī—AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 13-14).

4 *AB* on *NŚ*, 28. 13-15.

5 *Ava svarati gargaro godhā pari sanīṣyanat piṅgā pari caniṣkadadindrāya brahmodyatām*—*Ṛg.*, 8. 69. 9. The *godhā vīṇā* was probably covered with *godhā* (iguana) skin. The *Aitareya Āraṇyaka* (5. 1. 5) refers to the *yajamāna patnī* playing the *bhūmidundubhi* and *kāṇḍavīṇā*. Both the *godhā* and *kāṇḍa vīṇā* are mentioned in the *Sūtras* : *godhāvīṇāḥ kāṇḍavīṇāśca patnyo vādayanti*—*Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, 13. 3. 21. The *kāṇḍavīṇā* was so called as it was made of reed or arrow—*kāṇḍam śaraḥ tanmayyo vīṇāḥ. Vṛtti, l.c.*

6 *Āghāṭibhiriva dhāvayannaraṇyānirmahīyate*—*Ṛg.*, 10. 146. 2.

7 *Āghāṭi* and *karkarī* are often referred to—*Āghāṭibhiḥ piccholābhiḥ karkaṭikābhirityudgātāram patnyaḥ paryupaviśanti*—*Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, 16. 21. *Ā yatrāghāṭāḥ karkaryaḥ samvadanti*—*Atharvaveda*, 13. 4. 5. Commenting on this Sāyaṇa states : *ahanyahani vādyamānāḥ karkaryaḥ vādyaviśeṣāḥ samvadanti yuṣmānvṛttānuguṇyena samānam dhvananti*. The *karkarikā* or the *karkarī* may have had the *karkarī* fruit as a resonator.

8 *Patnya upagāyanti apaghāṭalikāstambalavīṇāḥ piccholā iti*—*Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra*, 21. 17. 16.

9 *Upagāyanti patnyopaghāṭalikās tālukavīṇāḥ kāṇḍavīṇāḥ piccholā alābu kapiśirṣṇīti*—*Hiraṇyakeśi Śrauta Sūtra*, 16. 6. 21.

10 *Vāṇaḥ śatatanturbhavati śatāyuḥ puruṣaḥ śatendriya āyuṣyevendriye pratitiṣṭhanti*—*Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, 7. 5. 9. 2. Cf. *Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, 13. 3. 25-27. *Pṛṣṭhyopakaraṇam bāṇena śatatantunā, mauñjāstantavaḥ. Vaitasaṁvādanam; audumbarīmudgatā'sandimārohatyādatte vāṇam śatatantum*—*Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, 16. 20-21.5.

11 *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, 23. 11. 28.

12 *Vāgbhadramiti triparvotkaṭaśalākayā veṇukāṇḍena vetasakāṇḍena vā vāṇam samvādya tena māhendrastotramupakaroti udgātā*—*Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra*, 21. 18. 6.

13 Lath, Mukund, *A Study of Dattilam*, p. 252. Deva, B.C., *The Music of India*, pp. 65-66.

14 *NŚ*, 29.118. Abhinava refers to the *vīṇā* being twenty-one stringed, *vīṇātyekaviṁśatitantrikā*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 38. 3-5. However, nowhere does Bharata speak of a twenty-one stringed *vīṇā*. Abhinava seems to be referring to the *mattakokilā* of later times. Śārṅgadeva mentions these three separately (*SR*. 6.9). He refers to the *citrā* being seven-stringed and the *vipañcī* being nine-stringed and of the two being played with the fingers and plectrum respectively (*ibid.*, 6. 10. 11). The *mattakokilā*, however, was the chief *vīṇā* of his times, being twenty-one stringed and all three octaves could be obtained on it (*ibid.*, 6. 112-13).

15 *NŚ*, 34. 14. The *ghoṣaka* is explained by Śārṅgadeva as the *ekatantrī vīṇā*, or the *vīṇā* with one string—*eṣo'pi janakaḥ prokto ghoṣakaścaikatantrikaḥ*, *SR*, 6. 109.

16 *Niśīthasūtra* (Rajkot, 1969), XVII. 253-56 and *Cūrṇī*, pp. 396-98.

17 *Saptatantūnvitanvānā yājakā yamupāsate—Mahābhārata, Droṇaparva*, 85. 18. (Gita Press ed., Vol. II, p. 559). *Vipañcī parigṛhyānyā nivātā nṛtyaśālinī—Rāmāyaṇa, Sundarakāṇḍa*, 10. 40-41.

18 *Navayogāṁ ghoṣavatīṁ kṛtvā śīghramānayo—Svapnavāsavadattā*, 6. *Hastena srastakoṇena kṛtamāka-savāditam—ibid*, 5. 6.

19 *Vaṁśam vādayāmi saptacchidram vīṇām vādayāmi saptatantrīm nadantīm—Mṛcchakaṭikam*, 5. 11.

20 *NŚ*, 29. 79-83.

21 ....*vīṇāvādyasvarūpamiti dhātavaḥ. Prahāraviśeṣajanyāḥ svarāḥ. Tatsamudāyopi janyāṁśakalpamāno dhātuḥ—AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 50.

22 *NŚ*, 29. 50.

23 *Ibid.*, 29. 51.

24 *Evamekaprahārabhavo vistārajaḥ*—Kallinātha on *SR*, 6. 135-36.

25 *Ibid.*, 29. 52.

26 *Anubandhastu jñeyo vyāsasamāsācca niyatameṣām hi—ibid.*, 29. 58. Abhinava explains this as the combination of the different types (i.e. *vistāraja, saṁghātaja sāmavāyaja). Vyāso' bhedānāṁ misratvena prayogaḥ—AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 58.

27 *NŚ*, 53.54.

28 *SR*, 6. 137. Kallinātha says—*Atra, vīṇāyām uttarasvaro mandro, adharasvarastāra ityanena vaiparītyam darśitaṁ bhavati śarīre hi adharo mandraḥ uttarastāra iti draṣṭavyam. Tatropapattimāha-uttarādharāghātaṁ hiti hi; yasmātkāraṇāt uttaratantrīghāto mandra-svarasya niṣpādakaḥ adharatantrīghātastārasvarasyetyarthaḥ*. Kallinātha on *SR*, 6. 137-41.

29 *NŚ*, 29. 55; cf. *SR*, 6. 140-41.

30 *NŚ*, 29. 56-57; *SR*, 6. 142-47.

31 *SR*, 6. 145.

32 Kallinātha on *SR*, 6. 142-47.

33 *SR*, 6. 146.

34 Kallinātha on *SR*, 6. 142-47.

35 *NŚ*, 29. 58.

36 *Laghugurvātmakairghātaiḥ karaṇaviddhayoḥ guru*. This would seem to give *kriyāḥ* a heavy stroke and *laghu*, *SR*, 6. 148, a light stroke.

37 *NŚ*, 29. 59.

38 *NŚ*, 29. 60.

39 *L.c.*

40 *SR*, 6. 149-50.

41 *NŚ*, 29. 62.
42 *SR*, 6. 151-53
43 Cf. *laghugurulaghubhiḥ plutaḥ; iti plutaḥ*—Kallinātha on *SR*, 6. 151-53.
44 Cf. *dviruccāritābhyāṁ laghugurubhyām atipātaḥ : ityatipātaḥ*—Kallinātha on *SR*, 6. 151-53.
45 *Caturvāram laghugurū uccāryante laghuratikīrṇaḥ ityatikīrṇaḥ*—Kallinātha on *SR*, 6. 151-53.
46 *SR*, 6. 153 and Kallinātha on it.
47 *Aṅgulibhedamātreṇa vyañjanastadbhidhām bruve*—*SR*, 6. 154.
48 *NŚ*, 29. 69.
49 *Ibid.*, 29. 64.
50 *Aṅguṣṭhābhyāṁ kanīyasya tantrīrekā nihanyate yugapadyatra tatpuṣpamabhileṣuḥ purātanāḥ*—*SR*, 6. 154.
51 *NŚ*, 29. 64.
52 '*Tantryoḥ*' is in the dual number denoting two strings, each struck by a thumb. Thus Abhinavagupta has '*aṅguṣṭhābhyāṁ samaṁ tantryān tu*' *(ntryostu) nānāsthānasvara (raḥ) tantrīdvayam ye yugapajjanyāḥ*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 64. Cf. also *ekasvaram yada nānāsthānakaṁ tantrikādvayam aṅguṣṭhābhyāmekakāle nihanti syātkalaṁ tadā*—*SR*, 6. 155-56.
53 *NŚ*, 29. 65.
54 *Vāmenāṅguṣṭhena tantrīṁ pīḍayitvā dakṣinena hanyāditi tālam*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 65.
55 *NŚ*, 29. 65.
56 *AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 65.
57 *SR*, 6. 159.
58 *NŚ*, 29. 66.
59 *L.c.*
60 *SR*, 6. 158.
61 *NŚ*, 29. 67.
62 *Tālam kṛtvāvaroheṇa ghāto'nusvanitammatam*—*SR*, 6. 158.
63 *NŚ*, 29. 67.
64 *Bindurekatra tantryām syātprahāro gurunādakṛt*—*SR*, 6. 157.
65 *AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 67.
66 *NŚ*, 29. 68.
67 *Ibid.*, 29. 74.
68 *L.c.*
69 *AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 73-76.
70 *NŚ*, 29. 75.
71 *Ribhi(phi)śca katthanayuddha (ninda)-hiṁsānādareṣu (himsadanesu) paṭhyate. ....yuddhādāvapi ca cāturyayoga evacitaḥ*—*AB* on *NŚ*,

29. 73-76.

72 *NŚ*, 29. 75.

73 *Ibid.*, 29. 71.

74 *AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 71.

75 *NŚ*, 29. 76.

76 *Ibid.*, 29.77. Thus states Abhinava—*etacca samastaṁ gītam vīṇāyāṁśakyaprayogam svarapada-tāla-niṣṭhitaprapañcam darśayati*....*tena tathāvidhagītena saha samavāyaḥ sammelanāsa tattvākhyo vādyavidhiḥ*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 77.

77 *NŚ*, 29. 77.

78 *AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 77-78. Cf. *SR*, 6. 173-74.

79 *NŚ*. 29. 78.

80 *AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 77-78.

81 *NŚ*, 29. 78.

82 Compare modern *jhaala* on the *sitar*.

83 *Tena vipañcyo vādye vādyante yānyuktaribhitādikaraṇamukhyā vīṇā vādyoparañjakāni vādanavaicitryāṇi tāni buddha (dhva) dhvamiti sambandhaḥ*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 112.

84 *NŚ*, 29. 114.

85 *AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 114.

86 *NŚ*. 29. 114.

87 *Tadvadeva anu paścād yadyu (du) cvate tatsamakālaṁ tadā (thā) kṛte sati tatpratibimkatayā pratikṛtamiti*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 114.

88 *AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 115.

89 *NŚ*, 29. 116.

90 *Yadā tu vaiṇiko kṣaṇe vidārīvaśācchedaṁ karoti tadā chidre vaipañcike yadā tadrūpaśeṣam*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 116.

91 *NŚ*, 29. 116.

92 *Atidruto vaipañcikaprayogaḥ sa oghaḥ*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 116.

93 *NŚ*, 29. 115.

94 *Tadeva punarvaicitryāṁ vaipañciko yadekasyāmeva tantryāmaṁśasaṁvādinyāṁ āl-patādi karoti tadā (pratiśuṣka). Pratiśuṣkapadasyaiṣāvasthetyanve*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 29. 115

95 The *nāḍī* was used to propitiate lord Yama. *Iyamasya dhamyate nāḍirayam gīrbhiḥ pariṣkṛtaḥ*—*Ṛgveda*, 10. 135. 7. Sāyaṇa explains this as a special sort of flute. *Iyaṁ nādiḥ vādyaviśeṣo veṇuḥ dhamyate vādyate yadvā nāḍīti vaṁśanāma iyam stutirūpā vāk*. Perhaps it was a kind of reed flute ?

96 *Mahase vīṇāvādam, krośāya tūṇavadhmam, avarasparāya, śaṁkhadhmam ānandāya talavam*—*Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, 3. 4.13-15. It seems that this *tūṇava* was constructed of wood. There is an interesting tale which says that Vāgdevī or the goddess of speech

being annoyed with the *devatās* entered the trees, plantations etc. Thenceforth goddess Vāgadevī sounds in the *dundubhi*, *tūṇava* or *vīṇā*.

97 *Rāyapasenīya Sutta*, number 64. *Niśīthasūtra*, p. 398. *Kharamukhī* was the same as *kāhala*; its frontal portion made of wood was shaped like the mouth of an ass. *Parīti* was an instrument made by joining together two pieces of hollow sticks and its mouth had only one opening. It was blown like a *śaṅkha* and it produced three different sounds simultaneously.

98 *Nāliya tti apāvuā bhavati, sapana loye 'murali' bhiṇṇati—Niśītha-cūrṇi*, 1, p. 84.

99 *NŚ*, 30. 1.

100 *Yaṁśātodyamiti pūrvaṁ bhagvānmaheśvarārādhanasādhanaṁ mataṅgamuni-prabhṛtibhirveṇunirmitaṁ tato vaṁśa iti prasiddham—AB* on *NŚ*, 30. 1.

101 The Dictionary defines *khadira* as the name of a tree; it gives the botanical name of the tree as *Acacia Catechu*—Apte's *Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, p. 391. Thus here *khadira* implies the wood of the *khadira* tree. Cf. Śārṅgadeva who, while discussing the *eka-tantrī vīṇa*, says that its beam was made of khadirawood—*SR*, 6. 29.

102 *Tathā coktam : vaṁśe sṛṣṭā yadā pūrvaṁ vaṁśasaṁjñā tu vaiṇavī vaṁśastu tu khādiro raupyaḥ kāṁśyajo vā sa kāñcanaḥ—AB*, IV, p. 139. Abhinava includes iron too. At another place he says—*vaṁśaprakārarūpam (loha) khādirāderapi saṁgrahaḥ—AB* on *NŚ*, 30; *AB*, IV, p. 140.

103 *SR*, 6. 425. Kallinātha explains *dāntaḥ* as *gajadanta-nirmitaḥ* i.e. made of ivory.

104 *NŚ*, 30. 2.

105 *Ibid.*, 30. 5.

106 *Ibid*, 30. 10.

107 *Nāradīya śikṣā*, 1. 3. 2.

108 Śūdraka, who is placed in the early Christian era, in his *Mṛcchakaṭika*, refers to a flute having seven holes *vaṁśaṁ—vādayāmi saptachhidraṁ vīṇām vādayāmi saptatantrīm nadantīm—Mṛcchakaṭikam*, 5. 11. It is possible that Bharata's flute consisted of seven holes, since he flourished somewhere about the same time.

109 *AB* on *NŚ*, 302.

110 *NŚ*, 28. 2.

111 *L.c. puṣkara* or *avanaddha vādya* are also referred to as *bhāṇḍa* by Bharata.

112 *NŚ*, 34. 2.

113 The legend runs something like this—Once, when the sage Svāti had gone to a lake to fetch water, Pākaśāsana (Indra) by sending great torrents of rain commenced to make the world a vast ocean. Torrents of water, falling with the force of wind made clear sounds on the lotus leaves in the lake. The sage heard these sounds in great wonder and observed that the high, medium and low sounds on the lotus-leaves were deep, sweet and pleasing. These sounds inspired him to the creation of *puṣkara vādya*. He then returned to his hermitage and created the *mṛdaṅga*, *paṇava* and *dardara* with the help of Viśvakarmā. On the pattern of the divine *dundubhi*, he created the *muraja*, the *āliṅgya* and the *ūrdhvaka āṅkika*—*ibid.*, 234. 4-10. Perhaps some text on *puṣkara-vādya* written by sage Svāti were known to Bharata. However, no such text is extant now.

114 *NŚ*, 34. 15; also *NŚ*, 34. 35.

115 *Ibid.*, 34. 26; see also *NŚ*, 34. 15.

116 *NŚ*, 34. 254. The earliest references to it are found in the *Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra*, *Kāṭhaka Gṛhya Sūtra*, *Arthaśātra*, *Mahābhārata*, *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Tripiṭaka*—Deva, *loc. cit.*, p. 89.

117 *Ibid.*, 34. 255.

118 *Ibid.*, 34. 256.

119 *Ibid.*, 34. 257.

120 *Ibid.*, 34. 258.

121 *Ibid.*, 34. 259.

122 *Ibid.*, 34. 260.

123 See fn. 17.

124 *NŚ*, 34. 12.

125 *Ibid.*, 34. 270.

126 *AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 270.

127 *NŚ*, 34. 82.

128 *AB* on *NŚ*, 28.

129 *AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 1-3.

130 *NŚ*, 34. 261-62. *Musical Instruments of India*, p. 77.

131 *AB* on *NŚ*, 28.

132 G.H. Tarlekar quotes Raghavan's view according to whom *tripuṣkara* is a drum with 3 faces. While discussing the 3 *mārjanās* he relates the notes to the 'left face of the drum', the 'right face of the drum' and the 'upper face of the drum'. Just after that, however, he gives the view of Abhinava and Nānyadeva relating notes to 3 separate drums viz. *āliṅgya*, *āṅkika* and *ūrdhvaka*. (Tarlekar, G.H., *Studies in the Nāṭyaśāstra*, p. 165-67). B.C. Deva (*Musical Instruments of India*, p. 97), however, says : "Some scholars are of

the opinion that the *puṣkara-traya* (three drums) referred to by Kālidāsa and earlier by Bharata, was an instrument with three heads; they are also of the view that such drums were also *bhāṇḍavādya* (pot-drum), though we have seen earlier while discussing the *mṛdaṅga* that the *puṣkara traya* were three different drums." He is of the opinion that *āṅkika*, *āliṅgya* and *ūrdhvaka* were 3 different *puṣkaras* played together by a single drummer. Each drum was differently tuned (*ibid*., p. 87).

133 Cf. Deva, B.C., *op. cit.*

134 See, fn. 30. See also Deva, B.C., *op. cit.*, p. 72-87.

135 *NŚ*, 34. 277-78. *Puṣkara traya* are not to be confused with *mṛdaṅga*, *paṇava* and *dardara*. Besides the fact that the *āliṅgaka*, *ūrdhvaka* and *āṅkika* have been clearly referred to as '*puṣkaratrayam*' by Bharata, Nānyadeva, too, refers to 6 types of *avanaddha* instruments. These were the 3 *puṣkaras*, *paṇava* and *dardara—Evam nāṭye ca nṛtte ca pañcātodyakamīritam. Pañcātodyakamiti. Puṣkaratraya-paṇavadardarāḥ*—(Nānyadeva, quoted *Bharatakośa*, p. 38). Obviously the *puṣkara-traya* do not include *paṇava* and *dardara* which are mentioned separately. They refer to the three varieties of *mṛdaṅga*.

136 *NŚ*, 34. 119.

137 *AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 119.

138 *NŚ*, 34. 45.

139 The oblique position of the *āṅkika* is referred to in *NŚ*, 34. 278. This is also suggested by the sculptures.

140 *AB* on *NŚ*. 34. 45.

141 *AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 42.

142 *NŚ*, 34. 49.

143 *Proktaṁ mṛdaṅgaśabdena muninā puṣkaratrayam—SR*, 6. 1027.

144 *NŚ*, 34. 39.

145 These *akṣaras* are referred as *varṇas* by Bharata.

146 *Ibid*., 34. 43-44.

147 *Ibid*., 34. 48.

148 *AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 49; also *AB* on *NŚ*. 34. 51.

149 *Vitastimātrākṣiptahastapraharaṇasūcanārthaṁ vitastamārga ityanye paṭhanti—AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 49.

150 *Ibid*., 34. 49.

151 Though *dvilepana* is listed after *caturmārga* (*NŚ*, 34. 36 and 40) but the concept of *trimārjanā* should be explained first as the concept of *lepana* follows logically after that.

152 *NŚ*, 34. 113.

153 Abhinava explains *vāmaka puṣkara* and *dakṣiṇa puṣkara* as *āliṅgaka*

and *āṅkika*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 119.
154 *NŚ*, 34. 119.
155 *Ibid.*, 34. 120.
156 *Ibid.*, 34. 121.
157 *Ibid.*, 34. 123.
158 *Ibid.*, 34. 125.
158a *Kādambarī Kathāmukha*, p. 131.
159 *Ibid.*, 34 127-31.
160 *Vādyakriyāṇām miśri(śra)tā yena kriyate tat karaṇamiti yāvat*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 109.
161 *NŚ*, 34. 102.
162 *AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 103.
163 *NŚ*, 34. 104.
164 *Ibid.*, 34. 105.
165 *Yatha (da) maurajiko virāmaṁ karoti tadā tatchidre pāṇaviko vā vādayati*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 106.
166 *NŚ*, 34. 107.
167 *Ibid.*, 34. 108.
168 *Ibid.*, 34. 136.
169 *L.c.*
170 *AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 137.
171 *Iha tu vādyamapi tena samaiḥ pāṇiprahārairavapāṇibhiḥ svavaratānāḍivaicitryapravṛttairyattatdanugatamevāha. L.c.*
172 *NŚ*, 34. 138.
173 *Ibid.*, 34. 139.
174 *Ibid.*, 34. 140.
175 *(akṣarasamam) padagatam tāvadgāne gurulaghunī vādye samam*—*AB* on *NŚ*. 34. 140.
176 *NŚ*, 34. 141.
177 *Ibid.*, 34. 142.
178 *Ibid.*, 34. 143-44.
179 *Ibid.*, 34. 145.
180 *Ibid.*, 34. 146.
181 *L.c.*
182 *NŚ*, 34. 147.
183 *NŚ*, 34. 59.
184 *Vāmasya hastasya vāmabhāgo dakṣiṇasaya dakṣiṇe pracaraṇam sa samapracāraḥ*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 59.
185 *NŚ*, 34. 60.
186 *Ibid.*, *l.c.*
187 *Ūrdhvakenāpi dakṣiṇa eva hastaḥ kāryaḥ*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 60.
188 *NŚ*, 34. 162.

189 *Ibid.*, 34. 110-15
190 *Ibid.*, 34. 46.
191 '*Yukta*' does not convey any meaning and should instead be '*mukta*'.
192 *NŚ*, 34. 40.
193 *NŚ*, 34. 191.
194 *Ibid.*, 34. 192.
195 *Ibid.*, 34. 193.
196 *Yatrākṣara-pāṇyādau sphuṭo vibhāgaḥ sa vibhaktaḥ*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 194; also *NŚ*, 34. 194.
197 *NŚ*, 34. 195.
198 *Anyasminnapi viṇādau vādyamāne'pi murajavādyasya madhye tūṣṇīmbhāvaḥ*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 195.
199 *NŚ*, 34. 196.
200 *Ibid.*, 34. 195-98.
201 *Gītamanusaradvādyasaṁśrayaḥ. Vādyasya gītasaṁśrayaṇamasminniti*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 199.
202 *NŚ*, 34. 199.
203 *Ibid.*, 34. 201.
204 *Ibid.*
205 *Śrāntavaditi. Vilambitalayena prāpnuyāt. Tadyathā. Muraja (ḥ) paṇavastato dardaraḥ*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 201.
206 *NŚ*, 34. 202
207 *Ibid.*, 34. 203.
208 *Ibid.*, 34. 204. Abhinava does not mention the *ardhāvakīrṇa*.
209 *NŚ*, 34. 205. The *avakīrṇa alaṁkāra* too has the *paṇava* playing overshadowing the *mṛdaṅga*, but the difference is that there the *mṛdaṅga* and *paṇava* are played together. *Samavṛttau tu tulyakālaprayoge sati*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 203-04. *Paṇava* playing probably was louder. In *parikṣipta* the two are not played together as *mṛdaṅga* playing is less frequent—*alpamṛdaṅgajam*.
210 *NŚ*, 34. 206.
211 *Ibid.*, 34. 207. Abhinava states : *praśāntasya gativiramasya niyamamanuvartamāno niyamānvitaḥ*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 207.
212 *NŚ*, 34. 208.
213 *Ibid.*, 34. 209.
214 *Ibid.*, 34. 210.
215 *Ibid.*. 34. 211.
216 *Ibid.*, 34. 212.
217 *Ibid.*, 34. 213.
218 *Ibid.*, 34. 148-49.
219 *Ibid.*

220 *Ekasyākṣarasya kṛtā āvṛttiryatra—AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 150.
221 *NŚ*, 34. 152. Perhaps this *jāti* was played on three *puṣkaras*, hence the name. This is also strengthened by the fact that it is to be played on all the *mṛdaṅgas—sarvamṛdaṅgaprahārayukta* (*NŚ*, 34. 152) and we know that Bharata has described three types of *mṛdaṅgas*, which are the *puṣkaratrayam*.
222 *NŚ*, 34. 153.
223 *Ibid*., 34. 154.
224 *Pātas* of two *gurus* and two *laghus* have been termed *toṭaka—guru-yugmam laghuyugmaṁ toṭakaṁ vāpi—NŚ*, 34. 154.
225 *Gurulaghupātān (toṭakamiti)—AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 154.
226 *NŚ*, 34. 155.
227 *Ibid*., 34. 156.
228 *(pārṣṇyā) ghātakṛta—AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 56. Though the GOS edition has not mentioned the *dakṣiṇa puṣkara* or the *āṅkika mṛdaṅga*, M.M. Ghosh does so (translation of *NŚ*, Vol. II, p. 180, verse 248).
229 *NŚ*, 34. 157.
230 *Ibid*., 34. 158.
231 By Bharata's description it seems that the *laya*, or tempo, is an accelerating one in the beginnig and then gradually becomes uniform.
232 *NŚ*, 34. 159.
233 *AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 159.
234 *Karaṇas* of *mṛdaṅga* are scattered two-fold and three-fold times on *paṇava* and *dardara*, says Bharata (*NŚ*, 34. 159).
235 *Adhamānām (samaviṣamagatipracāreṣu) teṣāmeva sambhramāvakīrṇe —AB* on *NŚ*, 34, 159.
236 *NŚ*, 34. 160.
237 *Ibid*., 34. 161.
238 *NŚ*, 34 162.
239 *Ekāṅkikamukha eva—AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 162.
240 *NŚ*, 34. 163.
241 *Ibid*., 34. 164.
242 *Ibid*., 34. 165-66.
243 *Ibid*., 34. 167.
244 *AB* ad *NŚ*, 34. 167.
245 *viṭādi-parikrame—AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 167.
246 *rājño nyeṣāmuttamānāṁ gatau—AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 168.
247 *NŚ*, 34. 169.
248 *Ibid*., 34. 10.
249 *Sānandāṁ nandihastaprahatarava*........
Saṅgītāya prahatamuraja...................– *Meghadūta*, 2. 1.

250 *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, p. 766.

251 *NŚ*, 34. 286. Abhinava explains : "*ūrdhva-karaṇamunnatam*", "*ātodyaṁ todanāt*"—*AB* on *NŚ*, 34.286. He equates *muraja* with *mṛdaṅga—tato jāto muraja mṛdaṅga ityarthaḥ*. *AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 10.

252 The *dundubhi* was an important part of Vedic ceremonies and was itself considered sacred. It is referred to in the Vedic literature; also *bhūmi dundubhi* which seems to be more primitive (See Deva, *Musical Instruments of India*, p. 19) *NŚ*, 34. 103; also *NŚ*, 34. 26.

253 *Maṅgalārthāni carmanaddhāni nābhūvan*—*AB* on *NŚ*, 34. 10.

254 *SR*, 6. 1147. Later authors like Someśvara have given the same sort of description—*Bharatakośa*, p. 273. According to Someśvara the plectrum was of deer horn.

255 *NŚ*, 34. 26. Cf. *Bhagavadgītā* 1. 13. *Bherī* is mentioned in several *Jātakas*; *Bherīvādajātaka* is completely devoted to it.

256 *SR*, 6. 1148-51; also see Somarāja quoted in *Bharatakośa*, p. 443. The *bherī* is commonly treated as *dundubhi* or "*nagāṛā*" (Deva, B.C., *Musical Instruments of India*, p. 79). But the descriptions of Śārṅgadeva and others show that the *dundubhi* and *bherī* were quite different.

Chapter 12

Concept of Rasa and the Foundations of Indian Aesthetics in Bharata

It is generally admitted that the concept of *rasa* is the most important Indian contribution to aesthetics, and that this concept reached its philosophical high watermark in the writings of Abhinavagupta.[1] Although in this development philosophical discussions on the nature and import of words, as also the metaphysics of different schools, specially Kashmir Śaivism, played the most important part, it is the *NŚ* of Bharata to which the concept of *rasa* owes its classical formulation. Since the *NŚ* is more in the nature of a traditional handbook or practical compendium, rather than a philosophical treatise, it is not surprising that its account of *rasa* is relatively simple and leaves philosophical enquiry unsatisfied, a deficiency which later commentators tried to remedy. Even so, the pronouncements of Bharata give the most authoritative expression to the traditional position on *rasa* and deserve the most careful attention.

In the very first chapter of the *NŚ*, it is stated that the *Nāṭyaveda* was created out of the four *Vedas—Jagrāha pāṭhyam Ṛgvedāt Sāmabhyo gītam eva ca/Yajurvedād abhinayān rasānātharvanadāpi.*[2] Here, *rasa* is a constituent of the play and different from its speeches, acting and songs. By inference, it seems to be that which the representations on stage seek to convey to the spectators. Modes of representation are exhausted by *pāṭhya*, *gīta* and *abhinaya*. The objective terms are drawn from myth, legend and imagination, which supply the stories and characters to be represented. What was the principle which enabled the organisation of these representations into a unity to produce a characteristic dramatic effect or impression on the spectators ? It could not be simply that of organising information, which would not be as such entertaining; nor could it be the purely formal and structuring principles of a non-conceptual art like music because that might entertain without instructing. We must remember that drama is conceived by Bharata as the imitation of life *(lokānukṛti)*, intending simultaneously to entertain and instruct its spectators. The nature of the object imitated, and of the process through which entertainment and instruction are effected, need to be explained in order to grasp the significance of *rasa*. In Greek drama, thus, the imitation is primarily of action and the

general effect it achieves is explained by Aristotle to be of the nature of catharsis, a kind of emotional purging. In Bharata, the object of imitation seems to be primarily *bhāva* in its diverse varieties and phases, and the mood or impression produced by this imitation, the total dramatic effect of the spectators, appears to be called *rasa*. Thus, the typical Sanskrit play has been judged by modern critics to be characterised by a comparative lack of action and marked sentimentality as compared to the Greek drama. While the charge of inaction or sentimentality is not true of the better plays, the fact that these are the directions in which the lesser plays characteristicly err, confirms that the basic orientation of the Sanskrit play is quite distinct from the Greek or modern drama. It may, thus, be said that the Sanskrit play is primarily a representation of a state of the mind, *bhāvānukīrtanam—trailokyasyāsya sarvasya nāṭyam bhāvānukīrtanam.*[3] The dramatic imitation of social life *(lokavṛttānukaraṇam nāṭyam)* considers it under the aspect of diverse feelings *(nānābhāvopasampannam)* and alternations of states *(nānāvasthāntarātmakam)*.[4] This imitation relates to human actions *(narāṇām karmasaṁśrayam)* and to human conditions and reactions of all kinds.[5] People have different characters, and dramatic representation follows this diversity as authenticated by social observation—*nānāśīlāḥ prakṛtayaḥ śīlānnāṭyam vinirmitam, tasmālloka-pramāṇam hi kartavyam nāṭyayoktṛbhiḥ.*[6]

What is represented is the nature of human life with its pleasure and pains—*Yoyaṁ svabhāvo lokasya, sukhaduḥkhasamanvitaḥ.*[7] Abhinava explains this by saying—*Evaṁ laukika ye sukhaduḥkhātmāno bhāvāḥ . samudayarūpāstasyaiva bhāvā*nusamayaḥ.*[8] That is to say, drama is essentially a representation of human experiences and feelings. It enables the spectator to view most vividly the very forms of pity, love, etc. *(AB—dayāratyādirūpānusaraṇabhūtaḥ).*[9]

It is, therefore, clear that action is not neglected in Sanskrit drama : it is certainly sought to be represented in its expressiveness of the inner psyche. As a result, the end which such representation serves is to lead the spectators to a state of simultaneous delight and instruction. This characteristic 'total impression' of the play on the spectator, as professor Nichol has termed it,[10] appears to be signified by the word *rasa* in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. It denotes the qualitative essence of the play and the peculiar quality of the experience it enables the spectator to achieve.

The sages ask Bharata five questions.[11] The first question is, what constitutes the essence of *rasa (rasatva)* ? The second is, how have the

* '*bhāga*' in the printed text.

bhāvas been mentioned and what do they effect (*bhāvayanti*) ? The third is, what is *saṅgraha* ? The fourth is, what is *kārikā*? The fifth is, what is *nirukta* ? These questions suggest that the present text of Bharata is in the nature of the recapitulation of an old tradition in which the concept of *rasa* had been already much discussed. Abhinavagupta, however, explains the five questions to refer to only *rasa* and *bhāva*. The first question refers to *rasa* and the other four refer to *bhāva*. These four are explained thus—(i) How have the *bhāvas* been brought up without having been mentioned before ? (ii) What is the nature of *bhāvas* ? (iii) Are the *bhāvas* so called because they produce (*utpādayanti*) ? (iv) Are they called *bhāvas* because they are pervasive (*vyāpnuvanti*) ?[12]

Bharata says that although it ts impossible to describe in detail, he would briefly expound *rasa* and *bhāva*, so that they could be understood by appropriate inferences. Abhinava explains *anumāna* as *lakṣaṇa*, since definitions giving the essential nature are identical with *vyatirekī hetus*, i. e. with the reasons adduced for separating something from other things. *Saṅgraha* is explained as the summary of what is expounded in detail in *sūtra* and *bhāṣya*. This list of topics (*saṅgraha*) consists of the following—*rasa*, *bhāva*, *abhinaya*, *dharma*, *vṛttis*, *pravṛttis*, *siddhi*, *svaras*, *ātodya*, *gāna* and *raṅga*. These are the elements of the science of dramatic representation. Abhinava points out that this list of eleven *aṅgas* is in accordance with the view of Kohala. On Bharata's view there should be only five consisting of the three-fold *abhinaya*, *gīta* and *ātodya*. The order of these was also debated between the followers of Udbhaṭa and Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa. The relevance of *rasa* and *bhāva* to acting and music has also been brought up by some commentators as mentioned by Udbhaṭa.[13]

Kārikā briefly expounds the theme of the *sūtras*. Abhinava explains that the difference between *sūtra* and *śloka* is not mentioned. Both are brief expositions but the *kārikā* follows the *sūtra* and is relatively elaborate. *Nirukta* is that exposition where the theme is discussed both with reference to the etymology of the words and the different principles involved.[14]

Bharata now mentions eight *nāṭya rasas*—*śṛṅgāra*, *hāsya*, *karuṇa*, *raudra*, *vīra*, *bhayānaka*, *bībhatsa* and *adbhuta*.[15] It should be noted that latter a ninth rasa, *śānta*, was also introduced and in the *AB* Abhinava regularly speaks of the nine *rasas*.[16] In the *Locana*, however, Abhinava quotes this verse with the reading eight—"these are the *rasas* mentioned by the Creator."[17] Then the *bhāvas* are described as three-fold—*sthāyī*, *sañcārī* and *sāttvika*. The *sthāyī bhāvas* are eight in number and hence confirm the number of *rasas* in Bharata to be

eight. Later on *nirveda*, or disinterestedness, was treated as the *sthāyī* for *śānta* but here it heads the list of the *sañcārīs*. Abhinava uses a varient reading *vismayasama* for *vismayaśceti*. Thus the thirty-three *sañcārī bhāvas* are enumerated in verses eighteen to twenty-one. It may be recalled that thirty-three was a conventionally significant number as it wast he number of the gods in the *Vedas*. Then the eight *sāttvikas* are mentioned—*stambha* etc. These are the physical expressions of emotions. The *abhinayas* are described as fourfold—*āṅgika, vācika, āhārya* (dependent on costume) and *sāttvika*; *dharmīs* are two—*lokadharmī* and *nāṭya-dharmī*; *vṛttis* are four—*bhāratī.sātvatī*, *kaiśikī* and *ārabhaṭī* The *pravṛttis* are *Āvantī*, *Dākṣiṇātyā*. *Oḍra-Māgadhī* and *Pāñcāla-madhyamā*. If *vṛttis* are styles, *pravṛttis* are obviously regional manners of representation. *Siddhi* is two-fold. divine and human. Then the seven notes are mentioned both as produced by the voice and *vīṇā*; so are the four types of instruments. Five types of songs are mentioned.[18]

Five typical occasions for music are mentioned, in each of which a *dhruvā* is sung. *Dhruvā* connotes both a song as well as its refrain. We have thus five types of *gāna* or *dhruvā*—*Praveśa-gāna* or *prāveśikī dhruvā*, *Ākṣepa-gāna* or *Ākṣepikī dhruvā*, *Niṣkrāma-gāna* or *Niṣkrāmikī dhruvā*, *Prasāda-gāna* or *Prāsādikī dhruvā* and *Antara-gāna* or *Āntarikī dhruvā*.[19]

After mentioning the technical elements of dramatic representation, Bharata proceeds to explain *rasa*. He assests that without *rasa* there can be no meaningful development of drama—*nahi rasādṛte kaścidarthaḥ pravartate*.[20] Abhinava offers several explanations of this line : "i.e. without *rasa* no object, such as *vibhāva* etc. can be presented to the mind for explanation, because without it no purpose in which understanding is preceded by delight gets furthered. Because when the spectators rest in that concentrated enjoyment which comes from *rasa*, no emotions and similar objects remain distinct in the mind. The whole unconscious ensemble of *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* etc. appears only as reduced to different mental states called *sthāyī* and sunk in it."

After this declaration of the pre-eminence of *rasa* in drama, comes the famous *rasa sūtra* of Bharata—*vibhāvānubhāva-vyabhicārīsaṁyogādrasaniṣpattiḥ*.[21]

It is worth noting here that the terms *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* and *vyabhicāribhāva* refer to stage representations, not to the realities of life. It follows, therefore, that the *rasa* they produce must also be a stage effect rather than some aspect of real life. That is why the *rasas* are called *nāṭya-rasas*. *Vibhāvas*, *anubhāvas* and *vyabhicāribhāvas* are represented through *abhinaya* on stage—*yoyam svabhāvo lokasya sukha-*

duḥkhasamanvitaḥ/saṅgikādvabhinayopeto nāṭyamabhidhīyate.[22] Abhinava explains—*Evam dayārtyā-dirūpānukaraṇabhūto nāṭya-lakṣaṇorthaḥ katham pratītigocarībhāvatayā aṅgikāditi yebhinayāḥ aṅgikādyāḥ no ca te liṅgasaṅketādirūpāḥ.*[23] The ensemble *(saṁyoga)* of the representations *(vibhāvādi)* induces a characteristic experience in the spectators *(rasa-niṣpatti)*. This experience is a union of subjective and objective aspects. Its subjective aspect is shown by the description of *nāṭya* as providing distraction from affliction *(vinodajananam)* and rest from weariness *(viśrāmajananam)* This kind of subjective effect may be seen in such pure arts as music, but drama presents an objective spectacle of the vicissitudes of life *(lokānukaraṇam, bhāvāmukīrtanam)* and is able to instruct *(upadeśajananam)* and give fortitude in suffering *(sthairyam dukkhārditasya ca...dhṛtirudvignacetasām)*. This instruction is of a moral nature since it effects emotional organisation. The experience of the spectators, thus, is neither purely emotional and subjective nor purely cognitive and objective. Its entertainment is not unstructured, such as provided by mere juggling or merely rhythmic dancing. Nor is its instruction merely conceptual or mediate, such as any *śāstra* may provide. It recognises the emotions by presenting the quintessential wisdom of life as a spectacle. The uniqueness of the dramatic experience or *rasa* is, thus, evident in Bharata. It is not mere excitement or sentimentality. for drama is described as a way to wisdom, the fifth *Veda*.

Thus, if we consider the concept of *rasa* in the context of the general dramatic theory of Bharata we see that it is not a merely descriptive or psychological category. It is rather an evaluative or aesthetic category. The reasons for this may be succintly stated thus—(a) *Rasas* are described as *nāṭyarasas,* and thus distinguished as such from what belongs to *loka*. As something belonging distinctly to dramatic performance and experience *rasa* is already *alaukika* by implication in Bharata. (b) *Rasa* is brought about by *vibhāva, anubhāva* and *vyabhicāribhāva*. The first two are clearly conceived as belonging to the stage primarily, not to reality. Although *vyabhicāribhāvas* may said to belong to pyschological reality, their combination *(saṁyoga)* with *vibhāva* and *anubhāva* suggests that *vyabhicāribhāvas* should be taken here to stand for the stage intimations of psychological factors that would also make the interpretation of *saṁyoga* quite simple. It will denote the combination of diverse stage representation into one unified spectacle. (c) Drama represents the vicissitudes of life through the use of *pāṭhya, gīta* and *abhinaya. Rasas* are mentioned besides these three as a fourth constituent. *Rasa* could thus be different from a mere technical factor of representation and could be interpreted to

be the characteristic aesthetic effect, tone or mood of the whole as apprehended by the spectators. (d) *Rasa* and *bhāva* are clearly distinguished in the *NŚ*. The *bhāvas* are effective psychic states while *rasa* is achieved by the spectator through the dramatic intimation of *bhāvas*. Just as in music, a procession of notes in certain combinations reveals a characteristic melodic whole or *rāga*, similarly, it seems that the representation of *bhāvas* reveals *rasa* as an aesthetic whole.

Although *rasa* is used by Bharata to indicate the peculiar flavour or quintessential quality of a dramatic performance and its experience, he does not give any philosophical analysis of the problems involved. Human reality, dramatic representation and aesthetic experience need to be related in an adequate manner. In Bharata, human reality has its focus in *bhāva* and dramatic representation is its *anukaraṇa* or *anukīrtana*. Aesthetic experience is called *rasa*, a unity of entertainment and enlightenment, and classified into eight, in relation to the gamut of *bhāvas*.

The notion of imitation is itself a puzzling one. What is the cognitive status of the apprehension of dramatic representation, is another puzzle. How the experience of life is transformed into an aesthetic experience needs to be explained. In the discussion of these problems, later commentators elaborated the notions of imagination, intuition, aesthetic distance, subjective universality, self-revelation mediated by feeling, and of the tranquility, illumination and beatitude of aesthetic experience. At the same time the notion of *rasa* was formally generalised beyond drama into poetry.

It is well-known that Bharata discusses *rasa* primarily in the context of drama but at a later date the concept of *rasa* was extended to poetry as well. Earlier, in authors like Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana poetry was discussed mainly in terms of figures of speech *(alaṁkāra)*, style *(rīti)*, qualities of composition *(guṇa)* etc.[24] It is only after Ānandavardhana formulated the theory of *dhvani* that the ground was prepared for the application of the theory of *rasa* to literature.[25] This common view, while supported by the chronology of the works is, however, mistaken in thinking that Bharata's conception of *rasa* was a limited one, applying only to drama. In fact, the connection of *rasa* with music is quite clear in the *NŚ*. Similarly, acting suggestive of *rasa* was part of *nṛtya* or expressive dancing. The tradition of visual arts, sculpture as well as painting, shows a clear connection with the poses and stances of dancing, and thus in the *citrasūtra* the connection of painting with *bhāva* and *rasa* is clearly established and the paintings at Ajanta constitute a standing proof of their dramatic character as well as *rasa* orientation. It is thus clear that drama, dance and

music, painting and sculpture shared a common aesthetic tradition which aimed at the expression of feeling through the creation of a vivid form. In the case of poetry and literature also, the concept of *rasa* was applied at least as soon as their dramatic character was proclaimed. The words which are the medium in literary writing are used in such a suggestive way that the situations they describe become dramatically evocative. The speech and gestures of the actor on stage are simply replaced by the words of the poet and their meanings.

Thus, even though Bharata does not discuss in a specifically theoretic manner the application of *rasa* to forms of art other than drama, he was fully aware atleast of the relevance of the concept to the performing arts. Even though the full application of the theory of *rasa* to poetry occurs only in the ninth century, one would still be justified in holding that in formulating the concept of *rasa* Bharata Muni was able to give expression in a most brilliant and original manner to a profound and seminal idea, an idea which was naturally and readily extended to other forms of art and letters and was seen to constitute their aesthetic essence.

The *rasasūtra* has been interpreted in diverse ways in the search for clarity and coherence. The two words which contained ambiguity of a high degree are *saṁyoga* and *niṣpattiḥ*. The classical interpretations range over many centuries after Bharata and represent diverse philosophical points of view of different ages. A brief analysis of these interpretations will serve to throw some light on the philosophical implications of the *sūtra* of Bharata, if not on its explicit intention.

The most important interpretations are those of Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa, Śaṅkuka, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka and Abhinavagupta himself. Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa represented the most ancient view.[26] Abhinava says that his interpretation was the one generally accepted by the older scholars. On this interpretation *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* and *vyabhicāribhāvas* have their primary focus in the characters of real life. In particular situations they are combined with the innate or instinctive attitudes called *sthāyī bhāvas*. These are thus developed and become *rasas*. This *rasa* is apprehended by the spectators through the agency of the actors, their gestures and enactments. *Rasa*, thus, becomes something objective which the play communicates to the spectator. We have here, on the one hand, a psychology of emotional attitudes. Under certain situations certain trains of emotions are generated and developed into intense experiences. The persons who are the objects of emotion are called *(ālambana) vibhāva*, i.e. objective causes. The situation itself in terms of time, place etc., which serves to arouse feelings, is called *(uddīpana) vibhāva*. The physical expression of emotional reactions, such as tears

or trembling, etc., are called *anubhāva*. Transient feelings such as worry, humility etc. are called *vyabhicāri* or *sañcāri bhāvas*. Thus when Duṣyanta catches sight of Śakuntalā being bothered by the bee in the *āśrama* of Kaṇva and regrets his own inability to pursue his own desire, we have Śakuntalā as the *ālambana vibhāva*, the situation in the *āśrama* as *uddīpana vibhāva*, the sighing of the king as *anubhāva* and the immediate feelings of the king as *vyabhicāri bhāvas*. We have, thus, a situation in which the latent *sthāyī bhāva* of *rati* in the king is developed and manifested. This is a situation in real life, a situation of actually felt emotional flow. On the stage, the real life situation is imitated and enacted by the actors. Viewing the actors on stages, the spectators belive that they are viewing the real life situation and thus through the force of *anusandhāna* apprehend *(pratīti)* the *sthāyī bhāva* of Duṣyanta, developed by *vibhāva*, etc.; and thus developed and apprehended this *sthāyī bhāva* is *rasa*. This interpretation is in close agreement with common sense, according to which the spectators see the real life through its enactment and apprehend its emotions in the process.

While the identification of *rasa* with *styāyī bhāva*, through the functioning of *vibhāva*, etc. follows the text of Bharata and is unquestionable, the interpretation of Lollaṭa suffers from inadequate attention to the manner in which the actors on the stage represent reality and succeed in communicating it, as also in the neglect of the spectator and his experience. Besides, it is not clear why the view of the real life emotion should entertain or instruct the spectators. Śaṅkuka attacks the theory at several points.[27] If the *sthāyī bhāva* is already real before combining with the *vibhāvas* etc., why does it need them ? On the other hand, if it is not real at stage, how can it combine with anything ? If one proposes numerous gradations of the *sthāyī bhāva* in the process of development, it will be too vague and mutable a thing to be classified in the manner in which the *ācāryas* have done it. From this Śaṅkuka concludes that the *sthāyī bhāva* of the real characters cannot be identified with *rasa* either in itself or conceived in terms of any programme of development. For Śaṅkuka, when the *sthāyī bhāva* of the character is imitated by the actor through the presentation of the *vibhāvas* etc., then it becomes *rasa* for the spectators. The natural causes, consequences and auxilliaries of the *sthāyī bhāva*, when presented on the stage, are called *vibhāva*, *anubhāva*, and *vyabhicārī bhāvas*. Perceiving and understanding these, the spectator is able to infer the *sthāyī bhāva* in the actor playing the role of the real character. Such an inferred and imitated *sthāyī bhāva* is *rasa*. The resultant apprehension of the spectator is not like anything in actuality. It is

neither true cognition, nor false cognition, nor doubt, nor is it the cognition of similarity. The spectator neither identifies nor distinguishes the actor from the character, nor does he see the one like the other, nor is he in a state of doubt. Nevertheless, he has a vivid experience which is unquestionable. This experience is explained by Śaṅkuka on the basis of the imitation of reality on the stage and a peculiar inferential apprehension of it by the spectator. The example of the picture horse *(citra-turaga)* has been brought up to illustrate the situation. The painted horse is not perceived to be real or unreal or merely as a likeness or a case of doubt. Its lines, colours, etc. enable the viewer to reach a peculiar inferential apprehension which is nevertheless vivid and unique.

The account of Śaṅkuka rightly emphasizes the nature of drama as an imaginative spectacle, which is apprehended in its own right. Neither is the apprehension cognitive nor is its content natural. The experience is unique and imaginative. At the same time, Śaṅkuka seems to connect the spectacle with reality through imitation and the discernment of what is imitated through inference. This seems to produce a contradiction. If the spectacle imitates reality, how can its apprehension not be the apprehension of *sādṛśya*? If the apprehension is gained through inference, how can it avoid being cognitive? The theory of Śaṅkuka, thus, is a curious blend of two different notions. On the one hand, it is the notion of drama as an imitation where the primary theme of the imitation of *sthāyī bhāva* is a matter of inference. On the other hand, the drama is conceived as an imaginative spectacle which forms the subject of a unique experience. The weakest link in the whole theory is provided by the notion of inference. Besides, the theory fails to explain the moving as well as instructive quality of the experience which the spectator undergoes. He only infers a *sthāyī bhāva* which itself imitates a real *sthāyī bhāva*.

Abhinavagupta has given a severe critique of the concept of imitation, namely of the *sthāyī-anukaraṇam rasaḥ*.[28] He asks where the original is not available, how is the imitation to be recognised? No one has perceived the *sthāyī* of Rāma, how can the *sthāyī* of the actor be perceived as its imitation? If it is argued that the *vibhāva* etc. presented on the stage lead to the apprehension of the *sthāyī* in the actor, even then the *sthāyī* will not be an imitation: it will be perceived as real. In fine, the two aspects of the theory of Śaṅkuka are badly patched together. The imitation inference approach to the art object and its perception tends to be realistic and overcognitive. On the other hand, the analysis of the art object in terms of the unique experience of a spectacle tends to be phenomenalisctic.

The characterisation of dramatic experience in its specific nature is carried forward by Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka.[29] He distinguishes between three different functions and levels through which aesthetic experience is generated and declares the last of these to be the enjoyment of *rasa*. The first stage is constituted by the presentation of the plain meaning or the situation which is called *abhidhā* or denotation in the case of words used in poetry. This, however, is accompanied by a peculiar process of generalisation called *bhāvakatva* or *vibhāvanā* or *sādhāraṇī-karaṇa*. This is really the imaginative transformation of reality into a spectacle which is lifted out of actual space, time or social relations. This is followed by a peculiar subjective experience where the mind is in a state of luminous peace and withdrawl into its own pure nature. This is called *bhojakatva*. On this view, thus, *rasa* is the subjective enjoyment of the *sthāyī bhāva* within a generalised or universalised context. The *sthāyī bhāva* which is here enjoyed is not to be identified with any specific or actual feeling whether of the real character or the actor or the spectator. It is rather the focal element in an ideal situation apprehended within a concrete or imaginative subjective vision. Drama presents the ideal truth of feelings and felt experiences imaginatively, thereby creating a generalised context which remains at the same time something concrete and directly experienceable. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka, thus, is able to expound the nature of *rasa* within the category of what may be called a subjective univeral, a notion which is analogus to that of Kant.

If Śaṅkuka had realised that art experience is not cognitive but imaginative, proceeding in the same direction Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka emphasizes the ideality and subjectivity of the experience. Bhaṭṭa Lollaṭa had connected *rasa* with *sthāvī bhāva* This connection is maintained in Śaṅkuka and Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka but realism is increasingly abandoned. *Rasa* now appears to be a peculiar enjoyment in art experience arising from the contemplation of felt images.

Abhinavagupta attacks the view that *rasa* is neither objectively apprehended *(raso na pratīyate)*, nor produced in reality, nor expressed. If there is neither *pratīti* nor *utpatti* nor *abhivyakti*, what is the the meaning of *bhoga*? If it is described as enjoyment, that too is some kind of knowledge. If the enjoyment or *bhogīkaraṇa* is described as the apprehension of the *sthāyī* in a peculiar subjective state, then Abhinava would accept it as correct with limitations but hardly sufficient. He accepts the view that *rasa* involves a contemplative enjoyment dependent on the apprehension of the *vibhāvas* etc.

It will be admitted on all hands that Abhinavagupta was the greatest thinker in the Indian tradition of aesthetics.[30] He was not only

a saint and philosopher but also a musician, poet and critic. He has interpreted the concept of *rasa* in the light of the theory of *dhvani* and the spiritual metaphysics of the *pratyabhijñā* school of Kashmir Śaivism. For him the world presented by a dramatic or poetic work is imaginative and quite distinct from the actual world. It is, therefore, described by him as *alaukika*. The actual world is based on causal forces. The representations in drama and poetry are only ideal and consist of images and meanings. That is why the *vibhāva* etc are *alaukika* and are not to be confused with the real causes, auxillaries and consequences of emotions in real life. Feelings are not presented or represented through any imitation on the stage. They are apprehended in terms of an immediate and subjective experience brought about by the evocative power of acting or words. The generalisation to which Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka alludes, transforms not merely the object of aesthetic experience and the relation of the spectator to it, but also the subjectivtiy or self-awareness of the spectator. Now the self of the spectator as of any other real human being consists of pure consciousness which has the innate capacity of self-expression. The whole universe is of the nature of such consciousness. All particular experiences arise out of this foundational consciousness or *saṁvit*, through specific determinations of subjectivity and objectivity. As a result, all experiences end up as the content of a moment of self-consciousness. This moment of restıng in the inward nature of consciousness *(saṁvidviśrānti)* constitutes a beatific moment. It is the peculiar virtue of aesthetic experience that by detaching the self from its natural or habitual determinations it leads it to a moment of inner experience, mediated by feelings and images. *Rasa*, thus, has to be understood as a kind of mediated and transitory self-experience. At this point it is not difficult to see how aesthetic experience at once moves and enlightens. It is described in terms of a vivid imaginative self-realisation. Such an experience has a peculiar illuminative intensity. It is the quality which is designated by *rasa*.

Abhinava admits that there has been a development in understanding and his own views depend on the contribution of earlier scholars.[31] The first point emphasised is that Bharata himself has stated *rasa* to be the meaning of the poetic work *(kāvyārtha)*. The proper reader of poetry or spectator of drama gathers from the words or acting something more than the obvious presentation. Such a reader has to be an *adhikārī*, i e. duly qualified. His heart must be capable of pure intuition *(nirmala pratibhāna)*. Such a person on hearing the sentences or watching the actors, attains to a mental intuition where the specific time and place of the direct meanings are disregarded. Thus, in the

presentation of fear, neither the object, nor the subject of fear are apprehended in relationship to any specific actuality. That is why the idea of fear is vividly experienced without the spectator being overcome by fear. The generalisation which is effected in this process of aesthetic experience is not a limited one. All limitations of space, time and casuality belonging to the actual world are disregarded in favour of a world created by imagination. All the spectators share in a common experience because despite their individual differences they all share in a common structure of instincts. The unobstructed contemplative consciousness is ecstatic *(camatkāra)*. *Rasa* is *bhāva* grasped in a such a state of intuitive contemplation.

Abhinava goes on to describe the several obstructions to aesthetic contemplation. They are diverse types of inability to comprehend—lack of plausibility, being tied to specific time and place co-ordinates of the subject and the object. being overcome by subjective pleasure or pain, lack of technical facility in comprehension lack of vividness, sub-ordination and doubt.

The *sthāyīs* relate to *puruṣārthas* and thereby acquire primacy. Thus *rati* is *kāma* with the associated pursuit of *dharma* and *artha*. *Krodha* relates to *artha*. *Utsāha* basically relates to *dharma* while *nirveda* relates to *mokṣa*. Thus the principal *sthāyī bhāvas* are connected with the principal *puruṣārthas*. All of them are of the nature of pleasure because intense self-experience is luminous and beatific in nature. This is shown by the fact that even when women are sunk in sorrow the expression of that very sorrow seems to make their burden lighter. *Duḥkha* is of the nature of restlessness and a self-absorbed tranquil state of the mind is necessarily full of bliss. In *vīra* etc. there is doubtlessly a trace of bitterness because of the peculiarities of the evocative situations, but then confrontation of plain is an essential character of heroism etc. Some *sthāyī bhāvas* like *rati* etc. have a lower status even though they please the common people. In fact, people with lower nature indulge in laughter. grief, fear, etc. quite frequently. Still such feelings can have a subordinate position in the context of the *puruṣārthas*. The distinction of the ten types of drama rests on this hierarchy of the *bhāvas*.

The *sthāyīs* are so called as they characterise the living being from birth. Everyone seeks pleasure, ridicules others on account of pride, is pained when separated from desired objects, is angry at the causes of such separation, fears them when he is helpless. while wishing to acquire things has a distaste for what is improper, marvels at the revelation of duties, and wishes to abandon many things. These mental states have their traces in every human being; only some have them

to a greater extent while others have them to a smaller extent. Some are oriented towards right objects, some towards wrong objects. Such differences are the basis of the classification of *prakṛtis*. Transient feelings like *glāni*, *śaṅkā* etc. are as if threaded on these permanent mental states.

Rasa, then, is neither memory nor inference nor ordinary perception. It is simply the enjoyment of its own nature by consciouness. *Rasa* is not an object of cognitive experience. It is a blissful mode of awareness. It is neither effected by *pramāṇas* nor by causes, but it is self-affirming.

This analysis by Abhinavagupta in which the work of a long line of critics and theoreticians finds its culmination undoubtedly belongs to an age much later that that of Bharata, but as Aristotle held, the nature of a thing is best revealed in its perfected form. In the *NŚ* of Bharata the formulation of *rasa* is elementary but seminal. We may now turn back to the text of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. The sages ask Bharata, what is the analogy, *dṛṣṭānta*.[32] The analogy given is of a mixed flavour which comes from the combination of many spices, herbs and substances. Similarly many feelings produce *rasa*. Thus, in the same way as *ṣāḍeva* flavours are produced from the mixture of substances, such as *guḍa*, spices and herbs, similarly the *sthāyī bhāvas* mixed with different *bhāvas* attain to the status of *rasa*. As to what constitutes the essence of *rasa*, the answer is delectability *(āsvādyatva)*. Just as gentlemen with taste enjoy the flavours of food prepared with diverse spices and are pleased, similarly spectators with taste enjoy the *sthāyī bhāvas* manifested by the enactment of different *bhāvas* alongwith the proper moments of speech, acts and involuntary reactions. This very idea is then expressed in two traditional verses. It is clear that the analogy of dramatic *rasa* and flavours is an old one. At this stage the question is raised as to whether *bhāvas* are produced from *rasa* or the *rasas* from the *bhāvas*.[33] There was an opinion that their mutual relationship underlay their production. But Bharata is quite clear that *rasas* are produced from *bhāvas* and not vice-versa, and he quotes several traditional verses in this context. These verses state that the *bhāvas* are known as such because they effect the *rasas* through diverse acting on the stage. Just as spices are tasted through different substances, similarly *bhāvas* alongwith *abhinaya* cause the *rasas* to be relished—*rasa* cannot be without *bhāva* nor *bhāva* without *rasa*. They are realised mutually in acting. Just as spices and herbs together make the food tasty, so *bhāvas* and *rasas* help each other. Just as from the seed springs the tree and from the tree the flower and the fruit, similarly *rasa* is the root from which all the *bhāvas* originate.

Thus three different views about the relationship of *rasa* and *bhāva* find mention in these verses and all three seem to receive support. One might reconcile them by saying that while in the dramatic representation the *bhāva* has temporal priority over *rasa* for the spectators, in the appreciation of *rasa*, *rasa* as a total idea or vision is the seed or matrix of the development of *bhāvas* and may be said to have a logical priority over them, in an Aristotelian sense. As aspects of the same aesthetic process, *bhāva* and *rasa* may be held to be independent.

The much quoted illustration of gustatory flavour can be illuminating as well as misleading or simplistic. It undoubtedly argues that *rasa* is a quality which is enjoyed or appreciated in a direct experience, a quality which results from *bhāvas* but itself resides in the whole. So far the illustration is useful but in so far as it suggests that *rasa* and *bhāva* are homogenous or that the tasting of *rasa* is a kind of sensation or emotion, it tends to be simplistic and misleading. In particular, the materialism of the illustration has encouraged a crude sensationalist or sentimentalist view of *rasa*. Perhaps the illustration should be understood in the context of a social situation in which the preparation of gustatory flavours and their tasting were regarded as a matter of high skill. We may recall that even now sophisticated tasters of tea can hardly bear to drink tea as a material beverage, so keen are they in its subtle favour or taste. What the illustration shows, then, is that *rasa* is a matter for the connoiseur—*Na rasanā-vyāpāra āsvādanam. Api tu mānasa eva. Sa cātra avikalosti, kevalaṁ loke rasanāvyāpārānantara-bhāvī sa prasiddha ityupacāra iha darśita iti* (*AB*, I, p. 290).

Next are described the four primary *rasas*.[34] These are *śṛṅgāra*, *raudra*, *vīra* and *bībhatsa*. From *śṛṅgāra* arises *hāsya*, from *raudra* arises *karuṇa*, from *vīra* arises *adbhuta* and from *bībhatsa bhayānaka*. Then the colours and deities of the *rasas* are described. *Śṛṅgāra* is blue with Viṣṇu as its deity, *hāsya* is white and Pramatha is its deity while *karuṇa* is grey and has Yama as its deity. *Raudra* is red with Rudra as its deity. *Vīra* is white and has Mahendra as its diety, *bībhatsa* is blue with Mahākāla as its deity, *bhayānaka* is black with Kāla as its deity and *adbhuta* is transparent and has Brahmā as its deity. In Abhinava's version *śānta* also figures. It is yellow in colour and has Buddha as its deity. The fact is that there was an ancient tradition of ascetic poetry which may be seen in the *Mahābhārata* as well as Buddhist and Jaina literature. The poetical biographies of the Buddha also exemplified the *śānta rasa*. It is, therefore, quite likely that while the dramatic tradition based on the epics represented principally tales of heroism and romance with their attendant incidents of tragic grief and revulsion, there was also an alternative tradition of ascetic poetry

which expressed the feelings of world-weariness. detachment, tranquility and illumination. The concept of *śānta rasa* possibly arose out of critical reflection over this tradition. The fact that Buddha is described as the deity of *śānta* tends to indicate such a possibility. It may be recalled that Ānandavardhana was to declare that *Mahābhārata* illustrated the *śānta rasa*. This is true of the present *Mahābhārata* with its *Śānti* and *Mahāprasthāna parvas*, but even if we do not accept the opinion of Western critical historians that the *Mahābhārata* was originally a tale of revenge with a tragic ending resembling Greek epics, it is still plausible to see the original *Mahābhārata* in the perspective of *vīra rasa*, with *Gītā* providing its keynote. Hence, it is doubtful if the original *Mahābhārāta* could have been the source of the recognition of the *śānta rasa*.

If the origin of drama is to be traced to the popular mimes of folk tales or legends or the social mimes of a ritualistic and mythical character, we should expect a two-fold classification in the dramatic tradition. There would, then, be a category of high serious plays and another of a more popular kind. Such a division is, in fact, quite clear in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* where the four primary types mentioned above belong to the former category, whereas several varieties of plays like *bhāṇa*, *prahasana*, *aṅka*, etc., have an obvious connection with popular and less sophisticated origins. The plays with the predominance of *vīra* and *raudra* and dealing with the conflicts of heroes and gods have an obvious connection with the orientation of Indra and Rudra-Marut myths, which were later on connected with the heroic tales of the epics. Thus, it is easy to see why *vīra* should have Indra as its deity and *raudra* Rudra. The connection of *śṛṅgāra* with Viṣṇu is not so easy to understand except in terms of the exploits of the human incarnations of Viṣṇu. It may be recalled that mythical tales of Viṣṇu were depicted in Kuṣāṇa art. Or, perhaps, Viṣṇu has been mentioned because the Paurāṇic tradition upheld him as the deity who maintained and nourished life. In any case, unlike heroism, which is well expressed in Vedic hymns, there is nothing adequately corresponding to *śṛṅgāra* in the Vedic hymns. Although some hymns are connected with love and marriage and the Vedic and Upaniṣadic tradition recognises the force of *kāma*, myths of romantic love are rare. Tales of romantic love were, however, amply provided by the epics at a time when Viṣṇu had already acquired an eminent position.

Śṛṅgāra is described as having a bright apparel. It is said to be comparable to whatever is pure, clean, bright and beautiful in the world. This description of *śṛṅgāra* shows the error of describing it as erotic in any mean sense. *Śṛṅgāra* depends on the relationship of man

and woman when they are young and high-minded *(uttamayuvaprakṛtiḥ)*. Abhinava explains that *rati* or love which is the *sthāyī* of *śṛṅgāra* is different from the mutual, erotic desire found in the natural world *(loka)*. It is also different from the transient emotion of desire which is a *vyabhicārī*. *Rati* as *sthāyī* is a constant, pervasive and wholly blissful. It is true that the poet and the spectator must both have experienced natural love to be able to create or appreciate love. Nevertheless, in *śṛṅgāra* the primary thing is inner consciousness not the physical appearances. Abhinava quotes here the verse fragment : "In my body there is only the imitation of the labour of breathing. My life really is Jānakī."[35] He goes on to say that when *śṛṅgāra* is described as *uttamyuvaprakṛtiḥ*, the reference is not to youthful bodies, but to consciousness—*tatrottamayuvaśabdena tatsaṁviducyate, na tu kāyaḥ*. Two forms of *śṛṅgāra*, *sambhoga* and *vipralambha*, are well-known but Abhinavagupta points out that the two are not really exclusive since in union also there is the fear of separation and in separation there is the hope of union.

Bharata raises the question : if *śṛṅgāra* is born of love *(rati)*, why are feelings of sadness and sorrow often found associated with it ? The answer given is in different conditions of love, such as of separation, some of the *vyabhicārīs* are similar to those of *karuṇa*. Thus, the masters of Kāmaśāstra have described ten stages of love, from desire to death. The difference between *karuṇa* and *vipralambha* is that the former is based on total despair, whereas the latter still has hope. It is interesting to note that Abhinavagupta declares that there is no *vipralambha* in the case of *adhama prakṛtis*.

Bharata has a remarkable statement which declares that *śṛṅgāra* is to be identified with man alongwith woman. Abhinava explains that man or woman here stand for the constant consciousness or *saṁvit* : "Hence love itself is man just as it has been said that man is nothing but faith."

In the description of *hāsya* it is made clear that it is mostly to be seen in woman or base natures. In contradiction to this, it is also added that on one view *hāsya* belongs to all the three *prakṛtis*.

Śṛṅgāra had earlier been described as two-fold. Now alongwith *hāsya* and *raudra* it is described as three-fold—consisting of speech, make-up and action. Obviously this three-fold division refers not to the essence of these *rasas* but to the modes of their dramatic representation.[36] The purpose of this classification is not clear. *Karuṇa* is similarly divided into three classes—produced from the destruction of *dharma*, of *artha* and on account of bereavement. *Vīra* is said to have three varieties—*dānavīra*, *dharmavīra* and *yuddhavīra*. *Bhayānaka* is

similarly three-fold—fear from disguise *(vyāja)*, fear from having committed a fault and fear from something terrible. *Bibhatsa* is described either as pure, which is due to *kṣobha* (disturbance), or as *udvegī* which is revulsion arising from foul things. *Adbhuta* is two-fold—either produced from seeing something celestial or sudden exhilaration Abhinava explains the latter as due to sudden attainment of some desire.

Many of these classifications are not wholly clear with respect to their significance, nor have the classifications been made on the basis of any single logical criterion. More interesting is Abhinava's comment that fear is generally seen among women and base characters. On *bībhatsa* he quotes an interesting view of his teacher Upādhyāya that the *śuddha* variety of *bībhatsa* refers to the revulsion which is the source of liberation and is inimical to the attachment located in the hero of the play which is called *saṁsāra*. Thus *śuddha bībhatsa* is born of the revulsion from the world, while the *udvegī* is a most superficial revulsion from foul things in the world.

Some versions of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* mention nine *rasas* including *śānta*. Its *sthāyī bhāva* is declared to be *śama* and its *vibhāvas tattvajñāna* etc. Among its *vyabhicārīs* is counted *nirveda*. Some traditional verses are quoted and they declare that *śānta rasa* is produced from inward meditation *(adhyātma dhyāna)* and *tattvajñāna*. *Śānta* is declared to be the nature of man, while the *bhāvas* are temporary products emerging from it. Owing to particular occasions, emotional states or *bhāvas* are produced out of natural quiescence.

This passage is most probably apocryphal because Abhinavagupta refers to it as the opinion of some. He also refers to the opinion of others who dispute it by saying that *śama* and *śānta* are synonymous. Besides, accepting *śānta* would contradict the number of *bhāvas* as forty-nine. They deny that there is any *śānta rasa*.

Abhinavagupta defends the *śānta rasa*.[37] He argues that like *dharma* etc. *mokṣa* is also a *puruṣārtha*. So just as the mental states relevant to *kāma* etc. are called *rati* etc. and become through the work of the poet and the actor the bases of the *rasas*—*śṛṅgāra* etc.—similarly the mental state proper to *mokṣa* should also be capable of being brought to the state of *rasa*. Some say that the *sthāyī bhāva* may be described as the indifference *(nirveda)* arising from the knowledge of truth. This indifference is different from that arising from poetry etc. Others hold this knowledge of truth *(tattvajñāna)* itself to be the *sthāyī*. Still others regard *śama* as the *sthāyī* and explain the relation of *śama* to *śānta* as *hāsya*. Some hold that as there are only eight basic attitudes, the *sthāyī* of *śānta* is simply the love of the spirit *(ātmaviṣaya rati)*. Some even suggest that all the eight *bhāvas* can be the

sthāyī of *śānta* in different circumstances. Thus, *śānta* may arise from perceiving the world as ridiculous or its events as tragic or through fear of worldly objects, or through revulsion from the pleasures of the world or through astonishment. However, Abhinava does not accept these and concludes that *tattvajñāna* is the *sthāyī* and it is distinct supersensuous knowledge. This *tattvajñāna* is the constant foundation on which all the other *sthāyīs* rest. On account of this difference in nature it is not counted among the forty-nine *bhāvas*. This *tattvajñāna* is *śama*. Hence, Abhinava concludes that there is a *śānta rasa* and says that in old manuscripts the definition of *śānta* is to be found after the line "*sthāyibhāvān rasatvamupaneṣyāmaḥ.*" Here *śānta* is mentioned before the other *rasas* because the savour of all the *rasas* largely culminates in *śānta*. They only present different media for its realization. Hence no separate *sthāyī* has been mentioned for it. That there are *nava rasas* is proved by its distinct apprehension by the spectators and by the evidence of *Itihāsa*, *Purāṇas*, dictionaries and Kashmir Śaiva canonical works. The experience of *śānta* is simply the experience of the states of mind like love, etc.

While one can easily think of examples of *śānta rasa* from poetry, it is difficult to point out any well-known extant example of *śānta* from plays near about the age of Bharata. It is, therefore, easy to see why Bharata should have described only eight, not nine *rasas*. Abhinava himself denies the title of *rasa* to *bhakti*, a point of view which had to be reversed in medieval works, such as of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī and Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavas.

What is the nature of the *bhāvas* ? Are they simply states of being or causes producing them ? The answer given is, *bhāvas* communicate the meaning of the creative works through vocal, physical and emotive gestures. *Bhāva*, *vāsanā* and deed have the same meaning in usage. Abhinavagupta explains that *bhāva* really means particular states of the mind. There are the forty-nine *bhāvas*. Through their different connections they become *sthāyī*, *sañcārī*, *vibhāva* and *anubhāva*. It is wrong to describe merely insentient externals such as the season or tears as *vibhāvas* or *anubhāvas*. Hence *sthāyī*, *vyabhicārī* and *sāttvika* are *bhāvas*; *vibhāvas* and *anubhāvas* are only incidental.

Bharata quotes verses saying that *bhāva* is the meaning brought about by the *vibhāva* and communicated by *anubhāvas* and acting.[38] *Bhāvas*, thus, cause the inner state of the poet to be known through acting. They are also so called because they cause *rasas* to be known through their acting.

Footnotes

1 See, Gnoli. R., *Aesthetic Experience According to Abhinavagupta*, Roma, 1956; Walimbe, Y.S., *Abhinavagupta on Indian Aesthetics*, Delhi, 1980; Masson and Patwardhan, *Aesthetic Rapture*. 2 Vols., Poona, 1970; Masson and Patwardhan, *Śāntarasa and Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Aesthetics*, Poona, 1969; Nagindas Parekh, *Abhinava kā Rasa-Vivecana*. Hindi tr., Varanasi, 1974; Sen, R.K., *Aesthetic Enjoyment*, Calcutta, 1966; Sastri, Pancapagesa, *Philosophy of Aesthetic Pleasure*, Annamalai, 1940; Pandey, K.C., *Comparative Aesthetics*. Vol. I and II, Varanasi, 1959; Pandey, K.C., *Abhinavagupta—An Historical and Philosophical Study*, Varanasi, 1963.

2 *NŚ*, 1. 17.

3 *Ibid.*, 1. 107.

4 *Ibid.*, 1. 112.

5 *Ibid.*, 1. 113.

6 *Ibid.*, 25. 123.

7 *Ibid.*, 1. 119.

8 *AB*, I, p. 44.

9 *Ibid.*. *l.c.*

10 Nicol, *Theory of Drama.*

11 *NŚ*, VI. 1-3.

12 *AB*, I, pp. 261-62.

13 *AB*, I, pp. 263-64.

14 *NŚ*, VI. 12-13.

15 *Ibid.*, VI. 15-16.

16 *Ibid.*, I, p. 267.

17 Cf. *Dhvanyālokālocana*, pp. 390-91.

18 *NŚ*, VI. 17-27.

19 *Ibid.*, VI. 28-30; *AB*, I, p. 270.

20 *NŚ*, Vol. I, p. 272.

21 *Ibid.*, *l.c.*

22 *Ibid.*, I. 119.

23 *AB*, Vol. I, pp. 248-49.

24 Bhāmaha, *Kāvyālaṅkāra*; Vāmana, *Kāvyālaṅkāra*; Daṇḍin, *Kāvyādarśa*.

25 Ānandavardhana, *Dhvanyāloka*; Abhinavagupta's *Locana* on it.

26 Gnoli, *op. cit.*, text, p. 3.

27 *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

28 *Ibid.*, pp. 6-10.

29 *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

30 Cf. *Ibid.*, Introd., pp. xxi ff.; Masson and Patwardhan, *Śāntarasa*,

pp. 1 ff.; Pandey, K.C., *Abhinavagupta, passim.*
31 Gnoli, *op. cit.*, text, pp. 13ff.
32 *NŚ*, Vol. I, pp. 287ff.
33 *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 292.
34 *Ibid.*, pp. 295ff.
35 *AB*, Vol. I, p. 302.
36 *NŚ*, VI. 77ff.
37 *AB*, Vol. I, pp. 332-40; Masson and Patwardhan, *op. cit.*
38 *NŚ*, VII. 1ff.; Vol. I, pp. 345ff.

Bibliography

(a) Principal Original Sources

Aitareya Āraṇyaka, ASS, Pune.

Āpastamba Śrauta-sūtra. Benaras, 1932.

Abhinavagupta, see under Bharata and Ānandavardhana.

Amarakośa, Varanasi, 1978.

Ānandavardhana, *Devīśataka*, edited with the comm. of Kaiyaṭa, Bombay, 1916; *Dhvanyāloka*, edited with Abhinavagupta's *Locana* by Pattabhirama Shastri, Banaras, 1940.

Agnipurāṇa, Varanasi, 1966.

Aṅgavijjā, edited by Muni Punya Vijay, Prakrit Text Series, Varanasi, 1957.

Aśvaghoṣa, *Buddhacarita*, Oxford, 1893; *Saundarananda*, Bhagalpur, 1948: *Śāriputraprakaraṇa*, fragment in Lüders, *SBAW*, 1911.

Bāṇa, *Harṣacarita*, Delhi, 1973; *Kādambarī*, Bombay, 1948.

Bṛhatkathāślokasaṅgraha, Varanasi, 1974.

Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra, Varanasi, 1972.

Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta.

Bhāmaha, *Kāvyālaṅkāra*, Tanjore, 1927.

Bharata, *Nāṭyaśāstra* : (a) edited with the comm. of Abhinavagupta by M. Ramakrishna Kavi, GOS Baroda : Vol. I (2nd rev. ed. by K.S. Ramaswami Shastri), 1956; Vol. II (*Adhyāyas* 8-18), 1934; Vol. III (*Adhyāyas* 19-27), 1954; Vol. IV (28-37), 1964, (rev. by Pade Shastri). (b) *Abhinavabhāratī* (Hindi translation of *Adhyāyas* 1, 2 and 6), edited by Nagendra with a Hindi *Bhāṣya* by Acarya Visheshvara, Delhi, Deptt. of Hindi, Delhi University, 1960. (c) Comm. *Bālakrīḍā* by Madhusudana Shastri on *Nāṭyaśāstra*, 3 Vols., B.H.U., 1971-81. (d) ed. *Kāvyamālā*, Bombay, 1943. (e) *Nāṭyaśāstra* with *Abhinavabhāratī*, ed. by R.S. Nagara, 4 Vols., Parimal Publications, Delhi, 1984. (f) *Nāṭyaśāstra*, Asiatic Society, Calcutta. (g) Translation of *Nāṭyaśāstra* by M.M. Ghosh.

Bhāravi, *Kirātārjunīyam*, Nirnayasagara, Bombay (NSP).

Bhartṛhari, *Śatakas*, ed. D.D. Kosambi, Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan, Bombay.

Bhāsa, *Plays ascribed to*, Poona, 1951, Translated by Woolner and Sarup as Thirteen Trivandrum Plays, Punjab University Oriental Publications, Oxford University Press, London, 1930-31.

Bhavabhūti, *Uttararāmacaritam*, N.S.P., Bombay; *Mālatīmādhavam*, N.S.P., Bombay.
Caturbhāṇi, ed. and tr. by Moticandra, Bombay, 1959.
Bhagavadjjukīyam, Madras, 1925.
Bhoja *Samarāṅgaṇa Sūtradhāra*, Baroda, 1966; *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇam*, Bombay, 1934.
Dāmodaragupta, *Kuṭṭanīmatam*, N.S.P., Bombay.
Daṇḍin, *Kāvyādarśa*, Calcutta University; *Daśakumāracaritam*, Bombay, 1931.
Dattilam, see Lath, M.
Dhanañjaya, *Daśarūpaka*, with Avaloka, Bombay, 1927; with Bahurūpamiśra's Comy., Varanasi, 1979.
Dīgha Nikāya, 3 Vols., P.T.S.
Hemacandra, *Kāvyānuśāsana*, Bombay, 1964.
Hāla, *Gāthāsaptaśatī* N.S.P., Bombay, 1911.
Hiraṇyakeśī Śrauta-sūtra, ASS, Poona.
Jayadeva, *Gītagovinda*, Hyderabad, 1969.
Jagannātha, Paṇḍitarāja, *Rasagaṅgādhara*, Kāvyamālā, 1939.
Kālidāsa, *Abhijñānaśakuntalam; Kumārasambhavam; Mālavikāgnimitram; Meghadūtam; Raghuvaṁśam; Vikramorvaśīyam.*
Kātyāyana Śrauta-sūtra, Acyuta-grantha-mala, Benaras.
Kauṭilya, *Arthaśāstra*, ed. R.P. Kangle, 3 Vols., Bombay, 1960.
Kāvyakalpalatāviveka, L.D. Institute, Ahmedabad.
Kumbhā, *Saṅgītarāja*, Varanasi, 1963.
Kuntaka, *Vakroktijīvita*, Delhi, 1955.
Māgha, *Śiśupālavadham*, Bombay, V.S., 1982.
Mahābhārata, 4 Vols., Pune, 1971-75.
Mammaṭa, *Kāvyaprakāśa*, Poona, 1965.
Mānasāra, ed. P.K. Acarya.
Mahimabhaṭṭa, *Vyaktiviveka*, Chowkhamba, 1936.
Manusmṛti, translated in S.B.E., Volume 25, Varanasi, 1967.
Manusmṛti with *Mitākṣarā*, Chowkhamba, 1935.
Mataṅga. *Bṛhaddeśī* with *Vṛtti*, Trivandrum, 1928.
Milindapañho, translated in S.B.E., Vol. 35-36; ed. P.T.S.
Mahendravarman, *Mattavilāsaprahasanam*, Varanasi, 1966.
Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa, Venkateshwar Press, Bombay.
Matsya-purāṇa, Venkateshwar Press, Bombay.
Nandikeśvara, *Abhinayadarpaṇa*, edited and translated by M. M. Ghosh, Calcutta, 1934.
Nānyadeva, *Bharatabhāṣya*, 2 Vols., Khairagarh.
Nāradīyaśikṣā, ed. in Satyavrata Samasrami's '*Uṣā*', Calcutta, 1890.
Pāṇini, *Aṣṭādhyāyī* with *Kāśikā*, Chowkhamba, 1931.

Patañjali, *Mahābhāṣyam*, Rohtak, 1961-63.
Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra, *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*, G.O.S., Baroda, 1929.
Ṛgvedasaṁhitā, with Sāyaṇa's commentary, 4 Vols , Poona; tr. by Griffith, 2 Vols.
Rāmāyaṇam, Bombay, 1930.
Rudraṭa, *Kāvyālaṅkāra*, Bombay, 1928.
Rūpakaṣaṭkam, G.O.S., Baroda.
Śārṅgadeva, *Saṅgītaratnākara*. with *Kalānidhi* of Kallinātha and *Saṅgītasudhākara* of Siṁhabhūpāla, 4 Vols., Madras, 1959; *Saṅgītaratnākara*, Vol. I, Varanasi, 1978.
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, (Eng. tr. in S.B.E.), 5 Vols.
Sāgaranandin, *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa*, Chowkhamba, 1972.
Saṁyukta Nikāya, P.T.S.
Śilparatna, 2 Vols., Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 1922.
Śāradātanaya, *Bhāvaprakāśanam*, Varanasi, 1983.
Sphūjidhvaja, *Yavanajātaka*, 2 Vols., H.O.S., Cambridge, 1978.
Śrīharṣa, *Naiṣadhīyam*, Bombay, 1933.
Śūdraka, *Mṛcchakaṭikam*, tr. H.O.S.
Subandhu, *Vāsavadattā*, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta.
Udbhaṭa, *Kāvyālaṅkārasārasaṁgraha*, Bombay, 1925.
Vāman, *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtravṛtti*, Calcutta, 1922.
Varāhamihira, *Bṛhatsaṁhitā*, 2 Vols., Varanasi, 1968.
Vasubandhu, *Abhidharmakośa*, Varanasi, 1970.
Vātsyāyana, *Nyāyabhāṣya*, Chowkhamba, 1942.
Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa, Third *Khaṇḍa*, critically edited by Priyabala Shah, Baroda, 1958.
Vāyu-purāṇa. Venkateshwar Press, Bombay.
Viṣṇuśarmā, *Pañcatantra*, tr. Ryder.
Viśākhadatta, *Mudrārākṣasam*, Banaras, 1937.
Viśvanātha, *Sāhityadarpaṇa* with the comm. and tr. of Salagrama Sastri, Delhi, 1986.

(b) Principal Secondary Sources

Agrawala, V.S., *Bhāratīya Kalā*, Varanasi, 1936; *Harṣacarita—eka Śāṁskṛtika Adhyayana*, Patna, 1964; *India as Known to Pāṇini*, 1963.
Aristotle, *Poetics*, Eng. tr. with notes, Delhi. 1984.
Barua, B.M., *Bharhut*, 3 Vols., Calcutta, 1934-37.
Bhatt, G.K.. *Theatric Aspects of Sanskrit Drama*, Poona, 1983; *Bharata Nāṭya-Mañjarī*.
Basham, A.L., *The Wonder that was India*, London, 1967.
Bhatkhande, V.N., *A Short Historical Survey of the Music of Upper*

India, Bombay, 1934.
Bose, A.N., *Social and Rural Economy of Northern India*, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1967.
Bṛhaspati, *Bharata kā Saṅgīta Siddhānta*, Hindi Samiti, Lucknow.
Brown, P., *Indian Architecture, Buddhist and Hindu*, Bombay, 1956.
Byrski, *Concept of the Ancient Indian Theatre*, 1974.
Chakladar, H.C., *Studies in the Kāmasūtra*.
Chattopadhyaya, B., *Kuṣāṇa State and Indian Society*, Calcutta, 1975.
Chattopadhyaya, S., *Social Life in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1975.
Chaudhuri, S.B., *Ethnic Settlements in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1952.
Coomaraswamy, A.K., *History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, London, 1927; *The Dance of Śiva*, London, 1925.
Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. II, Pt. I and II.
De Bary, W., *Sources of Indian Tradition*, New York, 1958.
De, S.K., *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Calcutta, 1960.
Deva, B.C., *Psychoacoustics of Music and Speech*, Madras, 1967; *The Musical Instruments of India*.
Fox-Strangways, A.H., *The Music of Hindostan*, Oxford, 1914.
Gangoly, O.C., *Rāgas and Rāginīs*, Bombay, 1958.
Gnoli, Raniero, *The Aesthetic Experience according to Abhinavagupta*, Banaras, 1968.
Gupta, C.B., *The Indian Theatre*, Delhi, 1954.
Havell, E.B., *The Ideals of Indian Art*, London, 1911.
Hiriyanna, M , *Art Experience*, Mysore, 1954.
Jairazbhoy, N.A., *The Rāgas of North Indian Music*, London, 1971.
Tarlekar, *Studies in the Nāṭyaśāstra*.
Kaufmann, W., *The Rāgas of North India*, Bloomington, 1968.
Kane, P.V., *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Delhi, 1961.
Keith, A.B., *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, Ist edn., London, 1920; *Sanskrit Drama*, OUP, 1924.
Krishnamurthi, *Indian Literary Theories*.
Krishnamachariar, M., *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*, Poona, 1937; reprinted, Delhi, 1970.
Lath, M., *A Study of Dattilam*, Delhi, 1978.
Levi, S., *Le theatre indien*, Paris, 1890.
Lucas, *Tragedy*.
Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde.
Majumdar, D.N., *Races and Cultures of India*, Bombay, 1961.
Majumdar, R.C. (ed.), *History and Culture of the Indian People*, Vols. I-V.
Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, 2 Vols. Delhi, 1967.

Maitland, F.W, (tr.), *Gierke's Political Theory of the Middle Ages*, Cambridge, 1930.

Mankad, D.R., *Ancient Indian Theatre*, Anand, 1950.

Marshall, Foucher and Majumdar, *Monuments of Sanchi*, 3 Vols., Bhopal.

Masson, J.L. and Patwardhana, M.V., *Aesthetic Rapture*, 2 Volumes, Poona, 1970l; *Śāntarasa and Abhinava's Philosophy of Aesthetics*, Poona, 1969.

Mookerji, R.K., *Chandragupta Maurya and His Times* Delhi, 1966.

Moticandra, *Bhāratīya Veśabhūṣa*, Allahabad, V.S. 2007; *Sārthavāha*, Patna, 1963.

Naidu, P.S., Naidu, V.N. and Pantulu, V.R., *Tāṇḍavalakṣanam or the Fundamentals of Ancient Hindu Dancing*, Madras, 1936.

Nicoll, A., *Theory of Drama*, London, 1937.

Pande, G.C., *Foundations of Indian Culture*, 2 Vols., Delhi, 1984.

Pandey, K.C., *Comparative Aesthetics*, Vol. I (Indian Aesthetics), 2nd ed., Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Vol. II, Varanasi, 1959; *Abhinavagupta, Historical and Philosophical Study*, Varanasi, 1963.

Paranjape, S., *Bhāratīya Saṅgīta kā Itihāsa*. Varanasi, 1969.

Pargiter, F.E., *The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*, Varanasi, 1962.

Popley, H.A., *The Music of India*, Calcutta, 1950.

Parekh, Nagindas, *Abhinava kā Rasa-Vivecana* (Hindi tr.), Varanasi, 1974.

Prajnanand, *A History of Indian Music*, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1963.

Raghavan, V., *Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa*, Madras, 1963; *The Number of Rasas*, Madras, 1967; *Some Concepts of the Alaṅkāraśāstra*, Madras, 1942; *The Social Play in Sanskrit*, Banglore, 1952.

Ramkrishna Kavi, *Bharatakośa*, Tirupati, 1951.

Rapson, E.J. (ed), *The Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I.

Rawson, P.S., *Indian Painting*, London, 1961.

Raychaudhuri, H.C., *Political History of Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1951.

Rowland, B., *The Art and Architecture of India*. London, 1967.

Roy, U.N., *Prācīna Bhārata men Nagara tathā Nagara Jīvana*, Allahabad, 1965; *Śālabhañjikā*, Allahabad, 1929.

Sankaran, S., *Some Aspects of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit or the Theories of Rasa and Dhvani*, Madras, 1929.

Schoff, W.H., *Periplus of the Erythrean Sea*, London, 1912.

Shankar, R., *My Music, My Life*, New York, 1968.

Sharma, G.R. (ed.), *Kuṣāṇa Studies*, Allahabad, 1968.

Shastri, K.A.N., *Age of the Nandas and Mauryas*, Delhi, 1967.

Shastri, S.N., *The Laws and Practice of Sanskrit Drama*, Varanasi, 1961.

Sircar, D.C., *Select Inscriptions*, Vol. I (1942); Vol. II (1985).

Singh, M.R., *Geographical Data in the Early Purāṇas*, Calcutta, 1972.

Smith, V.A., *The Oxford History of India*, Oxford, 1958.

Thapar, R., *Aśoka and the Decline of the Mauryas*. O.U.P.

Te Nijehuis, E., *Dattilam, a Compendium of Ancient Indian Music*, Leiden, 1970.

Trevelyan, G.M., *Illustrated English Social History*, Pelican, 1960.

Vatsyayana, K., *Classical Indian Dance in Literature and the Arts*.

Walimbe, Y.S., *Abhinavagupta on Indian Aesthetics*, Ajanta Publications, Delhi, 1980.

Warder, A.K , *Indian Kāvya Literature*, Delhi, 1972, 1973.

Yadava, B.N.S., *Society and Culture in Northern India in the Twelfth Century A D.*, Allahabad, 1973.

Zimmer, H., *The Art of Indian Asia*, 2 Vols., New York, 1955; *Myths and Symbols in Indian Art and Civilization*, New York, 1946.

(c) Select Articles

Athvale, R.B., "Ancient Sanskrit Drama and Music", *AIOC*, 1961.

Coomaraswamy. A.K., The Parts of *Viṇā*", *JAOS*, 1930, pp. 244 ff.; "The Old Indian *Viṇā*" *JAOS*, 1931, pp. 47 ff.; "Hindu Theatre", *IHQ*, 1933.

Deva, B.C., "Classification of Indian Musical Instruments", *Journal of the Indian Musicological Society*, Vol. 4, no. 1, 1973.

Ghosh, M., "The Hindu Theatre", *IHQ*, IX.

Kapadia, H.R., "The Jaina Data about Musical Instruments", *JOI*, Baroda, Vols. II-IV.

Krishnaswami, S., "Musical Instruments in Indian Plastic Arts", *Journal of the Indian Musicological Society*, 1975.

Mani, V.R., "Musical Instruments of Ancient India", *Bulletin of the Institute for Traditional Cultures*, Madras, 1965, pt. II.

Raghavan, V., "The *Vṛttis*", *JOR*, Madras, Vols. VI-VII.

Shastri, N.P., "The Origin of Indian Drama", *JASB*. Oct. 1909.

Wijesekara, O.H., Buddhist Evidence for the Early Existence of Drama", *IHQ*, Vol. XVII.

Index

A Significant Kusumanjali Title

POLITICAL HISTORY IN A CHANGING WORLD

Editor : **G C. Pande**

Joint Editor : **S. K. Gupta**

Asst. Editor : **Shankar Goyal**

The theme of the present work is the decline of political history in the recent decades. In his lead paper Dr. S. R. Goyal, Professor and Head, Department of History, The University of Jodhpur, Jodhpur, discusses the causes of this phenomenon and suggests that political history may regain its relevance if, instead of being concerned with only the deeds and dates of kings, it becomes the history of political life and institutions and studies them against the background of religious, social, economic and other factors and forces operating in society. On Professor Goyal's plea reaction papers have been written by most eminent historians of the whole country (including Professors G. C. Pande, Allahabad; B. N. Mukherjee, Calcutta; B. N. Puri, Lucknow; B. P. Sinha, Patna; Sibesh Bhattacharya, Allahabad; S. V. Sohoni, Poona; V. S. Pathak, Gorakhpur; L. Gopal, Varanasi; K. D. Bajpai, Sagar; A. V. Narasimhamurthy, Mysore; D. Balasubramanian, Annamalainagar; K. V. Raman, Madras; Upendra Thakur, Bodh-Gaya; Vivekanand Jha, New Delhi; and many others). Apart from them historians specialising in Epigraphy (Professors Ajay Mitra Shastri, Nagpur; K K. Thaplyal, Lucknow and T. P. Verma, Varanasi), Archaeology (Dr. S P. Gupta, Allahabad; Professor K. Paddayya, Pune and Shri R. Nagaswamy, Madras), Numismatics (Dr. P. L. Gupta, Anjaneri), Literature (Professor Jagannath Agrawal, Chandigarh) and Art (Dr. S.K. Gupta, Jaipur) have also commented on the suggestions of Professor Goyal. Eminent scholars from other countries including Professors Bongard-Levin (U. S. S. R.), A. K. Warder (Canada), J. P. Sharma and A. K Narain (U. S. A.), David N. Lorenzen (Mexico), Mubarak Ali (Pakistan), S D. Singh (Australia), Alois Wurm (Austria), T. R. Vaidya (Nepal) and Priti Kumar Mitra (Bangladesh) have enriched the theme by their valuable observations. The real multi-disciplinary nature of the book becomes evident by the fact that several scholars of other branches of knowledge including Professors Jagannath Agrawal (Sanskrit), A. C. Angrish (Economics), S. K. Lal (Sociology), Kamini Dinesh (English), M. C. Joshi (Psychology), A. K. Tewari (Geography), and L. S. Rathore (Political Science) have participated in the discussion. In it are also included papers of Professors Nurul Hasan, Romila Thapar and (the late) Buddha Prakash which cover some of the issues raised by Professor Goyal. Thus this volume provides rich food for thought to all those who are concerned with the decline of political history. Rs. 400.00

Distributors :

KUSUMANJALI BOOK WORLD

41-A, Sardar Club Scheme

Jodhpur - 342 001 (India)